DOCTRINAL INFLUENCE UPON THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

by

John William Stewart

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: December 6, 1966

Approved:

Kenneth W. Clark
Kenneth W. Clark, Supervisor

Wm. F. Stinespring

Arnold Weinmeister

James L. Price

Robert S. Rogers

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Religion in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Duke University

1966

ABSTRACT

DOCTRINAL INFLUENCE UPON THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

by

John William Stewart

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: December 6, 1966

Approved:

Kenneth W. Clark
Kenneth W. Clark, Supervisor

Wm. F. Stinespring

Orval Wintermute

James L. Price

Robert S. Rogers

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Religion in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Duke University

1966

TR. R.
PH. D.
S849D
1967

ABSTRACT

DOCTRINAL INFLUENCE UPON THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

by

John William Stewart

The basis for this investigation is the recognized fact that Clement's quotations from the New Testament vary frequently and often widely from the more acceptable manuscript evidence. This study examines the New Testament citations in Clement's writings to determine the degree to which these variants represent deliberate doctrinal motivation.

If interpretation involved alteration, it is necessary to understand how Clement justified his variants. An investigation of Clement's doctrines of canon and authority is made in an effort to determine if and when he understood himself to be quoting from New Testament Scripture, and what authority he understood the New Testament to possess for his and the Church's practice and doctrine. This is followed by an investigation into the manner in which Clement applies this authority to his practice and doctrine. Descriptions of the four interpretative principles of tradition, allegory,

unity of Scripture, and selectivity are given in an effort to explain how Clement could have changed a reading and still have felt that he was quoting the New Testament in a responsible manner.

The descriptions are followed by examples of doctrinal variants, classified under the four principles, as demonstrations that Clement altered certain readings for doctrinal reasons. The text for Clement's works is that of Otto Stählin in Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte.

The investigation has led to the conclusion that Clement did deliberately change certain readings for doctrinal reasons. Therefore, citations from the New Testament in the writings of Clement are not necessarily representative of the text which Clement knew and used. As a result, it is an unreliable practice to offer any New Testament quotation from Clement as evidence for his biblical text without first considering carefully the circumstances and purpose of the quotation.

Three implications may be drawn from this conclusion. In the first place, Clement's citations do not necessarily witness to the use of a corrupted text.

In the second place, Clement was not careless in his use of Scripture. It is improper to propose that Clement falsified the text or that he sought to maintain an untenable doctrine of canon and authority. Clement understood that his

task was not to deliver a copy of his text but to deliver the true teaching of his tradition.

In the third place, however, this does not mean that Clement's New Testament citations are worthless for an understanding of the text which Clement used. It is demonstrated that quite often the textual variants in Clement are understandable in the light of the context in which they are used, his doctrinal interest, and his principles of interpretation. And this clearly indicates that before a New Testament citation from Clement may be used as textual evidence, it must first be carefully considered in some manner similar to that used in this study.

It may be thought that Clement simply demonstrates the long suspected fluidity of the text in the second and third centuries. The force of this investigation has been to show that one major factor in Clement's variation from the text is not mere fluidity. Rather, Clement comes to the text with complete seriousness, and yet with purposes and principles of interpretation which, when not understood by the reader, appear to distort the New Testament.

PREFACE

The initial interest in the problem of doctrinal influence upon the New Testament text developed in the reading of "Textual Criticism and Doctrine" by Dr. Kenneth W. Clark.[1] If alterations for doctrinal reasons had occurred in copies of the New Testament text, they should also appear in citations of the Fathers. It was assumed that in the writings of a Father the doctrinal position of the writer would tend to support and explain the variant.

The writings of Clement of Alexandria were chosen for investigation for two reasons: the large number of variants in his citations, and the early date of his writings.

Did Clement deliberately change certain readings for doctrinal reasons? The study seeks to answer this question. The implications involve the trustworthiness of Clement's readings as witnesses for the reconstruction of his text. This implication would apply to other patristic writings to the extent to which they shared Clement's views.

If interpretation may include alteration, it is necessary to understand how Clement justified his variants.

---

[1]Kenneth W. Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan, Septuagenarii, ed. J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik (Haarlem: Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953), pp. 52-65.

Doctrine involves the definition of authority and the manner in which this authority may be applied. An investigation of Clement's doctrines of canon and authority is made in an effort to determine if, and when, he understood himself to be quoting from New Testament "Scripture," and what authority he understood the New Testament to possess for his and the Church's practice and doctrine. This is followed by an investigation into the manner in which Clement applied this authority to his practice and doctrine. What were the overall principles which governed his use of the New Testament? An effort is made to present the principles which determine his use, rather than methods. Clement has well defined principles, but he gave very little consideration to methodology. It would be possible to demonstrate some of his lesser principles, but the four interpretative principles of allegory, tradition, unity of scripture, and selectivity adequately explain how Clement could change a reading and still feel that he was quoting the New Testament in a responsible manner.

Examples of doctrinal variants, classified under the above four principles, are intended to demonstrate that Clement altered certain readings for doctrinal reasons.

For Clement's text the edition of Otto Stählin is used.[1]

---

[1] Clemens Alexandrinus, Vol. I, ed. Otto Stählin, Vol. XII of Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte (2nd ed.; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1936); Vol. II, ed. Otto Stählin and Ludwig Früchtel, Vol. LII of GCS (3rd ed.; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960); Vol. III, ed. Otto Stählin, Vol. XVII of GCS (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1909); Vol. IV, ed. Otto Stählin, Vol. XXXIX of GCS (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1936).

The double or single quotation marks are retained since they represent a judgment by Stählin of what Clement intended to quote directly.

Except where indicated the following translations are used: for Stromateis I, II, IV, V, and VI, the translation of W. Wilson;[1] for Stromateis III, the translation of Henry Chadwick, and Stromateis VII, the translation of J. B. Mayor, revised by Henry Chadwick;[2] for The Instructor, the translation of Simon P. Wood;[3] for The Exhortation to the Greeks, The Rich Man's Salvation, and To the Newly Baptized, the translations of G. W. Butterworth;[4] and for The Excerpta ex Theodoto, the translation of Robert Pierce Casey.[5]

The following abbreviations are used in referring to

---

[1]The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translation of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325, ed. Alexander Roberts and John Donaldson, translation of the writings of Clement by W. Wilson (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1951), II.

[2]Alexandrian Christianity, trans. John Ernest Leonard Oulton and Henry Chadwick, Vol. II of The Library of Christian Classics, ed. John Baille, John T. McNeill, and Henry P. Van Dusen (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954).

[3]Clement of Alexandria, Christ the Educator, trans. Simon P. Wood, Vol. XXIII of The Fathers of the Church (New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1959).

[4]Clement of Alexandria, trans. G. W. Butterworth, The Loeb Classical Library, ed. T. E. Page et al. (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1953).

[5]The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria, trans. Robert Pierce Casey, Vol. I of Studies and Documents, ed. Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake (London: Christophers, 1934).

Clement's writings:

Protr., The Exhortation to the Greeks;
Paed., The Instructor, The Educator, or Pedagogue;
Strom., Stromateis, or Miscellanies;
QDS, The Rich Man's Salvation, or Quis dives salvetur;
Exc. ex Theo., The Excerpta ex Theodoto;
Ecl. proph., Eclogae Propheticae.

My delay in the completion of this study has placed an extra burden upon my supervisor, Dr. Kenneth W. Clark, and the other members of my committee: Dean J. L. Price, Jr., Dr. W. F. Stinespring, Dr. Orval Wintermute, and Dr. R. S. Rogers. They have been most gracious in their assistance and continued interest.

John W. Stewart

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

PREFACE vi

INTRODUCTION 1

I. CANON AND AUTHORITY 7

Old Testament Canon, 7
New Testament Canon, 17
Authority of Scripture, 24

II. PRINCIPLES OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION: ALLEGORY 37

Allegory, 38

III. PRINCIPLES OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION: TRADITION, UNITY, AND SELECTIVITY 81

Tradition, 81
Unity of Scripture, 99
Selectivity, 118

IV. VARIATION IN CLEMENT 125

Tradition, 127
Allegory, 150
Unity of Scripture, 171
Selectivity, 194

CONCLUSION 208

BIBLIOGRAPHY 212

INTRODUCTION

The New Testament text of Clement of Alexandria has proven itself a difficult problem to textual critics. The writings of Clement are filled with scriptural quotations and allusions. This mine of early scriptural witness should produce excellent evidence for the text used in Egypt at the close of the second and the beginning of the third centuries. Unfortunately, the text represented in these writings has defied efforts to prove it a consistent representative of any known type.

Dean Burgon, in commenting on Clement's quotation of the extended passage of Mark 10:17-31,[1] makes the following observation:

> It is impossible to produce a fouler exhibition of S. Mark x 17-31 than is contained in a document fully two centuries older than either B or ℵ,--Itself the property of one of the most famous of the ante-Nicene Fathers.[2]

---

[1] QDS, 4, 4-10.

[2] Dean Burgon, Revision Revised, cited by F. C. Burkitt in P. Mordaunt Barnard, The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria, Vol. V, No. 5 of Texts and Studies, ed. J. Armitage Robinson (Cambridge: University Press, 1899), p. vii. Although Burgon was a champion of the Textus Receptus, this statement is not given to indicate that Clement failed to reproduce the Textus Receptus, but as partial evidence that he failed to reproduce any recognizable text of the New Testament. See Tollinton's statement immediately following on pp. 2-3.

This comment becomes the more striking in view of the fact that this is not only quoted *in extenso*, but that this passage forms the basic text for the whole of *The Rich Man's Salvation*. The quotation is introduced by Clement with the remark: "For there is nothing like hearing once more the actual sayings which . . . have continued until now to trouble us in the gospels."[1] At the close of his quotation Clement adds: "This is written in the gospel according to Mark, and in all the other accepted gospels the passage as a whole shows the same general sense, though perhaps here and there a little of the wording changes."[2]

It would be natural to assume that Clement intends to give Mark's exact account. In opposition to this assumption R. B. Tollinton makes the following comparison between this passage as found in Stählin's edition of Clement and Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament:

> There are 265 words in the quotation. Verse 25 (15 words), part of verse 27 (8 words), part of verse 29 (8 words), or 31 words in all, are best omitted from detailed comparison, because the deviations in these verses are too considerable for such a method to be employed. Of the remaining 234 words in Clement's text 25 differ from those found in the Gospel, as Westcott and Hort present it; 20 words are added; there are 21 omissions, and 8 changes of order. The influence both of Saint Matthew's Gospel, and of Saint Luke's to a less degree, is apparent in Clement's version of Saint Mark's text. For at least 10 of the above-named differences there is other MS. authority of considerable weight, but, even deducting these as doubtful, we have as the net outcome of the comparison 64 deviations from the best evidenced text of Saint Mark in a total of 234 words. The proportion of

---

[1] *QDS* 4, 3. [2] *QDS* 5, 1.

> divergence, if it can be estimated numerically, rises to something like 1 difference for every 4 words. In addition to this, the three passages left out of account because of their own greater deviation (31 words) must be borne in mind.[1]

It would be difficult to find among any of the early fathers a quotation with more divergences.[2]

Nevertheless, in spite of the apparent freedom with which Clement treats his text, he not only centers his teachings in Scripture, but gives every indication of being intimately acquainted with it. Scripture, for Clement, was more than a formal study; it was a way of life:

> But all his [the true gnostic's] life is a holy festival. For instance, his sacrifices consist of prayers

---

[1] R. B. Tollinton, Clement of Alexandria. A Study in Christian Liberalism (London: Williams and Norgate, 1914), II, 185f.

[2] A comparison of eccentric readings of Clement in Luke and John with the readings of P^{75} produced only the following instances in which Clement agreed with P^{75} against Nestle's text: Lk. 12:24, οτι ουχ σπειρουσιν, ουδε θεριζουσιν; 12:29, μη τι πιητε; Jn. 1:18, ο μονογενης; 4:34, ποιησαι; 10:27, ακουει. A similar comparison of Clement's readings in John with P^{66} produced the following: Jn. 1:3, ουδεν; 4:34, ποιησαι; 6:4, αναστησω αυτον . The similarity of divergent readings is strikingly small. Cf. Papyrus Bodmer XIV, XV: Evangiles de Luc et Jean, eds. Victor Martin and Rodolphe Kasser (Cologny-Genève: Bibliothèque Bodmer, 1961); Papyrus Bodmer II: Evangile de Jean, ed. Victor Martin (Cologny-Genève: Bibliothèque Bodmer, 1956, Supplément, 1958). For collations of P^{75} and P^{66} see Kurt Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri II," New Testament Studies, XI (1964-1965), 1-21 and X (1963-1964), 62-79. Readings from both papyri are included in the critical apparatus of Novum Testamentum Graece, eds. Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, and Kurt Aland (25th ed.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964). For a discussion of these two papyri see Ernest Cadman Colwell, "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text," The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J. Philip Hyatt (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), pp. 370-89.

> and praises and the reading of the Scriptures before dining, and psalms and hymns during dinner and before going to bed, aye and of prayers again during the night.[1]

To his personal life must be added his twenty years of teaching in the Catechetical School at Alexandria. His writings, which contain his teaching, illustrate that Clement was a part of the extraordinary interest of his day in exegesis. The struggle with the heretics of this period was not so much a question of canon as the proper interpretation of recognized books. The heretics threatened to capture the Church's books. Melito of Sardis wrote a book entitled The Key.[2] Irenaeus combated heresy, not with Scripture alone, but with the traditional interpretation of Scripture. Tertullian found it necessary to lay great emphasis upon the Apostles, through whom the Scriptures came, and, on the basis of their improper interpretation, he denied the heretics their right to the Scriptures:

> . . . if the Scriptures are to be their source of strength, then the question as to who are the rightful possessors of the Scriptures must be considered first, in order to prevent their use by one who has no manner of right to them.[3]

To be a Christian teacher in Clement's day was to be an approved biblical exegete.

Clement was by nature and training a man of books.

---

[1] Strom., VII, vii, 49, 3.

[2] Eusebius, H.E., IV, xxvi.

[3] Tertullian, Prescription, 15. (ANF)

All authority and all truth lay somewhere on the written page. This was the motive for his study in Greek philosophy. Even after his conversion he continued to document his teachings with profuse quotations from the Greek pagan writers. As a Christian thinker he rather simply became a scholar of a new body of literature. This literature, the books of Scripture, became his primary source of truth. To this source he turned his attention as a devoted scholar.

Clement may appear at times to follow the paths of the philosophers, but he at least convinced himself that Scripture was his primary source of inspiration:

> And if our words seem to some of the uninstructed to be different from the Lord's Scriptures, let them know that it is from the Scriptures that they draw their life and breath, and that it is their object, taking these as their starting point, to set forth, not their phraseology, but their meaning only.[1]

It was Scripture which, he believed, kindled the living spark of the soul and directed the eye suitably for contemplation.[2]

Thus we see the strange contrast of a great Christian thinker who sought ultimate truth and meaning in the Scriptures and yet who apparently was not always literal in his use of the text. Even if we should recognize the possibility of extensive use of memory citations through thorough familiarity, this possibility would not suffice to answer satisfactorily an apparent unconcern for the ipsissima verba of the text. Since this study seeks to investigate the

---

[1] Strom., VII, i, 1, 5 (i.e., text plus interpretation).

[2] Strom., I, i, 10, 4.

possibility of doctrinal influences in some of Clement's quotations, it is important to understand the attitude that would permit a careful scholar to take Scripture seriously and formal text indifferently.

CHAPTER I

CANON AND AUTHORITY

"He who believeth then the divine Scriptures with sure judgment, receives in the voice of God, who bestowed the Scripture, a demonstration that cannot be impugned."[1] The Scriptures are a gift from God, the voice of God, and the final and incontestable proof from God.

If the Scriptures are the medium of divine truth, it is appropriate to consider first of all just what Clement considered to be the Scriptures.

Old Testament Canon

There is, at present, genuine doubt concerning the long accepted fact that a definite list of canonical books was drawn up by the rabbis at the Council of Jamnia (ca. A.D. 90). Nevertheless, efforts to control orthodoxy in the Diaspora, a concern in rabbinical circles after A.D. 70 over excessive eschatological interest, and the use by Christians of Jewish books in the Jewish-Christian controversy required definite commitments from Jewish leaders concerning the authority of their various books.

---

[1] Strom., II, ii, 9, 6.

Eusebius preserves a letter of Melito of Sardis to Onesimus, his brother, in which Melito gives the results of his investigation on the Old Testament canon in "the east . . . where these things were preached and done."[1] His canon corresponds exactly with that of the present Hebrew canon with the one exception of the omission of the book of Esther.[2]

An investigation of Clement's quotations and references to the Old Testament indicates that Clement makes use of all the books of the present Hebrew canon with the exceptions of Ruth, Nehemiah, Obadiah, and Song of Songs.[3] However, Clement treats the apocryphal books in apparently the same manner as he does the Hebrew canon. A summary of Clement's references follows. This summary includes all references whether of the nature of direct quotation, paraphrase, or allusion. The number of references given for each book is the present writer's count of the citations listed in Otto Stählin's biblical index in his edition of Clement.[4]

Genesis--232 references.
Book is mentioned by name.
Exodus--158 references.
Not mentioned by name, but quoted as Scripture.
Leviticus--70 references.
Mentioned by name.
Numbers--21 references.
Mentioned by name.

---

[1]Eusebius, H.E., IV, xxvi.

[2]Esther is also missing among those canonical books recovered at Qumran.

[3]But including Esther.

[4]Clemens Alexandrinus, IV, 1-10.

Deuteronomy--133 references.
Not mentioned by name, but quoted as Scripture.
Joshua--2 references.
Mentioned by name.
Judges--37 references.
Mentioned by name.
Ruth--0 references.
No mention nor allusion.
I Samuel--20 references.
Mentioned by name.
II Samuel--7 references.
Reference to David may be taken from either II Samuel or I Chronicles.
I Kings--30 references.
Attested by Clement's use of the historical data.
II Kings--40 references.
Attested by Clement's use of the historical data.
I Chronicles--7 references.
Reference to David may be taken from either II Samuel or I Chronicles.
II Chronicles--15 references.
This material may be from I Kings.
I Ezra--2 references.
II Ezra--3 references.
IV Esdras--3 references.
Indicated as a saying of "Esdras the prophet."
Nehemiah--0 references.
Mentioned by name.
Psalms--281 references.
The most quoted book of the Old Testament.
Proverbs--209 references.
Mentioned by name.
Ecclesiastes--3 references.
Mentioned by name.
Song of Songs--0 references.
Neither named nor quoted.
Job--24 references.
Quoted as Scripture.
Wisdom of Solomon--32 references.
Mentioned by name.
Ecclesiasticus--74 references.
Mentioned by name.
Esther--4 references.
Clement shows a knowledge of the person of Esther.
Judith--3 references.
The narrative of Judith is referred to.
Tobit--7 references.
Quoted as Scripture.
Hosea--13 references.
Quoted.
Amos--8 references.
Quoted as Scripture.

Micah--3 references.
Quoted.
Joel--4 references.
Quoted.
Obadiah--0 references.
Neither named nor quoted.
Jonah--10 references.
Quoted by name.
Nahum--1 reference.
Quoted.
Habakkuk--7 references.
Quoted.
Zephaniah--3 references.
Quoted.
Haggai--4 references.
Quoted.
Zechariah--9 references.
Quoted.
Malachi--4 references.
Quoted.
Isaiah--196 references.
Quoted as Scripture.
Jeremiah--70 references.
Quoted as Scripture.
Baruch--8 references.
Quoted as Scripture.
Lamentations--4 references.
Quoted as Scripture.
Ezekiel--43 references.
Quoted.
Daniel--26 references.
Quoted.
Additions to Daniel--3 references.
References only.
II Maccabees--2 references.

It will be noted that there are no references to Ruth, Nehemiah, the Song of Songs, and Obadiah among the Hebrew canonical books. Of the apocryphal books included in Codex Alexandrinus, Clement's writings contain references to all but the following: Epistle of Jeremiah, I, III, IV Maccabees, and Psalms of Solomon.

Such omissions among our canonical books are not particularly significant save in the instance of the Song of Songs. In addition to the factor of Clement's personal

interest and the demands of his writing, Ruth was often regarded as one book with Judges. Nehemiah is mentioned by name as the chief cup-bearer of Artaxerxes and the builder of the city of Jerusalem and restorer of the temple,[1] but there is no mention of his book.[2] Obadiah must have been included in Clement's Book of the Twelve. Obadiah is universally attested to be one of the Twelve. Clement's writings contain references to the other eleven minor prophets, and use once the term, 'the Twelve.'[3] Esther is mentioned by name (along with Mordecai) as living during the captivity. There is even a notice of her book.[4] She is praised as one of the examples of admirable women who helped to save Israel through her perfect prayer to God.[5] Nevertheless, this list of women includes not only Judith and Susanna, but also a lengthy list of worthy Greek women. Stählin suggests the possibility of a quotation from Esther, but this is most doubtful.[6] Clement

---

[1] Strom., I, xxi, 123, 1.

[2] The books of Ezra and Nehemiah were originally a part of the books of Chronicles. After their separation from Chronicles, they were counted, even in the early Septuagint, as one book. Cf. Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 541-42.

[3] Strom., I, xxi, 122, 4. πάλιν αὖ μετὰ τοῦτον προφητεύουσιν Ἀγγαῖος καὶ Ζαχαρίας ἐπὶ Δαρείου τοῦ πρώτου ἔτη δύο, μεθ' ὃν ὁ ἐν τοῖς δώδεκα Ἄγγελος.

[4] Strom., I, xxi, 123, 2. ἐν τῇ αἰχμαλωσίᾳ ταύτῃ γίνεται Ἐσθὴρ καὶ Μαρδοχαῖος, οὗ φέρεται βιβλίον ὡς καὶ τὸ τῶν Μακκαβαϊκῶν.

[5] Strom., IV, xix, 119, 1-3.

[6] Protr., IX, 88, 2. ἀκούσατε οὖν ὦ οἱ μακρὰν,

knew the book of Esther, accepted her as one of the ancient heroines, yet did not regard the story in general nor Esther's persuasive beauty in particular as edifying or instructive. Clement felt free to flit through the entire Bible, much like his Sicilian bee, "gathering the spoil of the flowers of the prophetic and apostolic meadow."[1] All was available and might be gathered and mixed at will according to taste. But the freedom to choose at random connotes the freedom to reject. Selectivity is very definitely an exegetical principle. What Clement failed to quote may be just as important an indication of doctrinal influence as what he quoted, or misquoted.[2]

Even more pointed is Clement's complete silence on the Song of Songs. The emotional language of physical love was incompatible with Clement's nature.[3] This book must await the bold spiritualizing of Origen.

Before turning to the apocryphal books it would be

ἀκούσατε ὁοἱ ἐγγύς]ε Esther 9:20, τοῖς ἐγγὺς καὶ τοῖς μακράν. Dan. 9:7, τῷ ἔγγιστα καὶ τῷ ἀπωτέρω. Is. 57:19 (Eph. 2:17), τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς. The word order would suggest that the citation came from Isaiah.

[1] Strom., I, i, 11, 2.

[2] For a graphic view of Clement's actual use of the New Testament see John M. Norris, "The Functional New Testament of Clement of Alexandria" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1945). Norris presents visually Clement's actual use of the New Testament by means of a bar graph. The horizontal axis of the graph contains one increment for each verse in the New Testament. The height of the bars indicates the frequency of use for each individual verse.

[3] Cf. also Tertullian's remarks on The Shepherd of Hermas in On Modesty, X.

well to note Clement's use of citation formulae to introduce Old Testament Scripture. These are in accord with those of other Greek Fathers. John Patrick[1] classifies Clement's citation formulae under three categories. There are the usual formulae which imply authority or inspiration: ἡ γραφή, ἡ θεία γραφή, αἱ γραφαί, αἱ θεῖαι γραφαί, αἱ κυριακαὶ γραφαί, αἱ θεοπνεύσαται γραφαί, γέγραπται, τὸ πνεῦμα, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τὸ πνεῦμα διά, φησί, εἴρηται, etc. The traditional authors themselves are sometimes mentioned: ὁ Μωυσῆς, παρὰ τῷ Μωυσεῖ, ὁ πάνσοφος Μωυσῆς, ὁ θεσπέσιος Μωυσῆς, ὁ Δαβίδ, κατὰ τὸν Δαβίδ, ὁ μακάριος Δαβίδ, ὁ ψαλμῳδός, κατὰ τὸν μακάριον ψαλμῳδόν, ὁ Σολομῶν, κατὰ τὸν Σολομῶντα, ὁ Ἡσαΐας, παρὰ Ἡσαΐᾳ, ὁ Ἰερεμίας, etc. In a few instances the books are referred to: οἱ ψαλμοί, ὁ ψαλμός, ἐν τοῖς ψαλμοῖς γέγραπται, γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Δαβίδ, αἱ παροιμίαι, ἡ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ σοφία, ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ εἰρημένον, ἐν τῷ Ἰερεμίᾳ γέγραπται, ἐν τῷ Ἰεζεκιὴλ γέγραπται, etc. In the majority of citations, and especially allusions, there is no indication of source or implication of scriptural authority. Clement's whole thought is suffused with Scripture. He attempted to think scripturally, and demanded of his audience a similar approach and background.

Little can be gained from an attempt to set up criteria based on citation formulae in order to judge Clement's attitude toward the canonicity of individual books.

---

[1]John Patrick, Clement of Alexandria (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1914), pp. 209-10.

Such an attempt was made by Patrick[1] with the following conclusions: The absence of ἡ γραφή, γέγραπται, etc. would eliminate as authoritative the books of Numbers, all the historical books from Joshua through II Chronicles, Daniel, and all the Minor Prophets except Amos and Haggai. The absence of inspirational formulae, such as τὸ πνεῦμα διά, would eliminate as inspired books Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom of Solomon, Ezekiel, Daniel, and all the Minor Prophets except Amos and Zephaniah. No conclusion can be drawn concerning the authority or inspiration. If this were a valid test, Jeremiah would be of unequal authority or value to Isaiah, and Ezekiel would be inferior to both.

For the matter at hand, the importance of this observation lies in the fact that in view of Clement's erratic and undisciplined use (or lack) of formulae in the Old Testament, no formulary criteria should be employed in determining his view of the canonicity or authority of any New Testament book.

With regard to the apocryphal books, Clement introduces quotations from Ecclesiasticus by formulae identical with those which he places before passages from Prophecy or the Law. Ecclesiasticus is cited thirteen times as ἡ γραφή. In these citations both ὁ θεῖος παιδαγωγός and Σοφία speak.

---

[1]Patrick, pp. 218-20.

Clement is simply not concerned with the problem of Old Testament canon. This problem did not become pressing until the time of Origen. Here we enter a new world filled with a concern for precise words in definite books. Origen's Hexapla is ample evidence of this concern. Eusebius quotes from Origen's lost Commentary on the Psalms his "catalogue of the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament":

> But it should be known that there are twenty-two canonical books, according to the Hebrew tradition; the same as the number of the letters of their alphabet.[1]

There follows a list of the names of the books in the present Hebrew canon with, it should be noted, a transliteration and, where proper, a translation of their Hebrew names. He concludes with the remark: "And outside these there are the Maccabees, which are entitled Sar beth sabanai el." There is no mention of the so-called Septuagint canon. Origen explained his own position in his Letter to Africanus. Susanna and Tobias are to be considered part of the inspired Scriptures on the ground that they were read everywhere in the Church.[2] In his Homilies on Numbers he includes among books suitable for beginners: Esther, Judith, Tobias, and Ecclesiasticus.[3] Origen accepted the practice of the Church, but his textual studies left him with primarily the

---

[1]Eusebius, H.E., VI, xxv. (Loeb)

[2]Origen, Epistle to Africanus, 2, 12.

[3]Origen, Homilies on Numbers, 27, 1.

Hebrew canon. The columnar arrangement of the Hexapla as well as the critical siqla leave no question of this.

Clement remained unaware of this future concern. In his Exhortation to the Greeks Clement, as a matter of style, spends the first five chapters demonstrating the absurdities of Greek thought and practice. Chapter Six presents the sporadic witness of the philosophers to truth. Chapter Seven presents the same for the poets. Chapter Eight finally brings us to the witness of the prophets:

> Now that we have dealt with the other matters in due order, it is time to turn to the writings of the prophets. For these are the oracles which, by exhibiting to us in the clearest light the grounds of piety, lay a firm foundation for the truth. The sacred writings are also models of virtuous living, and short roads to salvation. They are bare of embellishment, of outward beauty of language, of idle talk and flattery, yet they raise up man when fast bound in the grip of evil. Despising the snare of this life, with one and the same voice they provide a cure for many ills, turning us aside from delusion that works harm, and urging us onward with clear guidance to salvation set before our eyes.[1]

With such an exalted introduction the reader prepares himself to at last learn the full truth as pronounced by some such great bearer of the Word of God as Isaiah. Clement continues: "To begin with, let the prophetess, the Sibyl, first sing to us the song of salvation."

This is Clement. Some concept beyond the "canonical books, according to the Hebrew tradition" controlled his understanding of what constituted Scripture. The demonstration

---

[1]Protr., VIII, 77, 1.

of this concept must await the section in Chapter Three on "Tradition."

New Testament Canon

There is no question of Clement's familiarity with the great majority of the books in our New Testament canon. The only questionable books are four of the Epistles: Philemon, James, II Peter, and III John.

A summary of Clement's New Testament references to the various books of the New Testament follows. As with the above summary of Old Testament usage, the number of references given for each book is the present writer's count of the citations listed in Otto Stählin's biblical index in his edition of Clement.[1]

Matthew--699 references.
Mentioned by name.
Mark--170 references.
Mentioned by name.
Luke--385 references.
Mentioned by name.
John--313 references.
Mentioned by name.
Acts--58 references.
Mentioned by name. Authorship assigned to Luke.
Romans--269 references.
Mentioned by name.
I Corinthians--386 references.
Mentioned by name.
II Corinthians--107 references.
Mentioned by name.
Galatians--88 references.
Mentioned by name.
Ephesians--147 references.
Mentioned by name.

---

[1] Clemens Alexandrinus, IV, 11-29.

Philippians--47 references.
Mentioned by name.
Colossians--73 references.
Mentioned by name.
I Thessalonians--28 references.
Not quoted by name.
II Thessalonians--4 references.
Not quoted by name.
I Timothy--73 references.
Mentioned by name.
II Timothy--21 references.
Mentioned by name.
Titus--17 references.
Mentioned by name.
Philemon--0 references.
No mention of name.
Hebrews--104 references.
Mentioned by name. Authorship assigned to Paul.
James--21? references.
No clear evidence of knowledge.
I Peter--99 references.
Mentioned by name.
II Peter--8? references.
No mention of name.
I John--73 references.
Mentioned by name.
II John--6 references.
Clement knew of two letters by John.
III John--1? reference.
No mention by name.
Jude--29 references.
Mentioned by name.
Revelation--34 references.
Mentioned by name. Authorship assigned to John.

Non-canonical Writings
Apostolic Fathers:
Didache--8 references.
Barnabas--34 references.
I Clement--61 references.
Hermas-22 references.
Ignatius--9 references.
Polycarp--2 references.

Other:
Gospel to the Egyptians--9 references.
Gospel to the Hebrews--5 references.
Gospel According to James--1 reference.
Tradition of Matthew--5 references.
Acts of John--1 reference.
Assumption of Moses--3 references.
Apocalypse of Isaiah--1 reference.

Enoch--4 references.
Sibyline Oracles--24 references.
Apocalypse of Peter--5 references.
Preaching of Peter--9 references.

Nothing can be deduced from Clement's silence concerning Philemon. The omission was possibly due to its brevity.

The references to James and II Peter are questionable. Eusebius wrote concerning Clement:

> And in the Hypotyposeis to speak briefly, he has given concise explanations of all the Canonical Scriptures, not passing over even the disputed writings, I mean the Epistle of Jude and the remaining Catholic Epistles, and the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Apocalypse known as Peter's.[1]

From the above it would be deduced that Clement knew and wrote upon both James and II Peter. However, there is no clear evidence in his extant writings. All the possible references to these two books, as given by Stählin, are doubtful, and Stählin so indicates. Nevertheless, Stählin believes that both are quoted.[2] Zahn finds traces of James, but not of II Peter.[3] Kutter[4] and Patrick[5] find the evidence

---

[1]Eusebius, H.E., VI, xiv.

[2]Clemens Alexandrinus, III, 48.

[3]Theodore Zahn, Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literature. Theil III, Supplementum Clementinum (Erlangen: Verlag von Andreas Deichert, 1884), pp. 151-53.

[4]Hermann Kutter, Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament; eine Untersuchung (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1897), pp. 1, 100.

[5]Patrick, pp. 223f., 235.

too uncertain. Tollinton[1] expresses doubt but concedes the probability that both letters were known to Clement. One of the twenty-one possible references to James[2] should be judged as evidence that Clement knew this letter: τὸν πλησίον ἀγαπᾶν [James, ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον] καὶ εὐεργετεῖν δύνασθαι [James, καλῶς ποιεῖτε], οὐκ ἔσεσθε βασιλικοί [James, νόμον τελεῖτε βασιλικόν]. None of the eight possible references to II Peter is conclusive.

The statement of Eusebius may also be applied to III John. However, this letter is even more doubtful than II Peter. There are no possible references unless we see τὸ ⟩εἰρήνη σοι⟨[3] as a quotation of III John 15. This address, however, is not only a common expression, but it is also used elsewhere in the Johannine literature.[4] Some hold that Clement seems to assume only two letters of John when he writes: φαίνεται δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ μείζονι ἐπιστολῇ.[5] But the so-called comparative form, in Greek, is not limited to two elements. There is no proof that Clement knew III John.

The conclusion must be that Clement knew at least the

---

[1]Tollinton, II, 172.

[2]Strom., VI, xviii, 164, 2 on James 2:8.

[3]Paed., II, vii, 58, 3.

[4]John 20:19, 21, 26.

[5]Strom., II, xv, 66, 4.

greater part, if not all, of the New Testament books which now stand in our present canon. This does not necessarily imply that Clement had a rigid concept of canon. His free use of other Christian materials makes such a judgment impossible. Clement shows an awareness of criteria, but not of a rigid demarcation of authority. He knew the acceptance of the four Gospels: "In the first place we have not got the saying in the four Gospels that have been handed down to us [ἐν τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἡμῖν τέτταρσιν εὐαγγελίοις], but in the Gospel according to the Egyptians."[1] He shared the functional canon of the early church in seeing the words and deeds of Jesus as of first importance and authority. Jesus is resorted to again and again as the ultimate source of Christian knowledge. The large number of quotations from canonical Gospels as compared with non-canonical Gospels is indicative that the former were preferred even if the latter were accepted. Clement even retells the tradition of Mark first writing his Gospel in Rome as a result of Peter's preaching.[2]

Clement shows a recognition of the criteria of the writer's apostolicity.[3] Paul is regularly referred to as

---

[1] Strom., III, xiii, 93, 1.

[2] Eusebius, E. H., VI, xiv.

[3] Cf. Adolf Harnack, The Origins of the New Testament and the Most Important Consequences of the New Creation, trans. J. R. Wilkinson (Covenant Garden: Willian and Norgate, Ltd., 1925), pp. 7-25.

ὁ ἀπόστολος. Clement feels that the apostolicity of Hebrews is important enough for him to defend its Pauline authorship.[1] The rule of apostolic authorship, of course, does not confine Scripture unduly. There is no recognizable difference in Clement's treatment of the Didaché and canonical Scripture.[2] The same may be said of I Clement (the phrases γέγραπται, φησί, and ὁ ἀπόστολος are all used), of Hermas, and, to a lesser degree, of Barnabas.

Two facts should be borne in mind. First, Clement's personal views should be considered. He is a strong, independent thinker in search of truth. In keeping with his early training he sought truth wherever it might lie, and accepted it for its own worth. This, no doubt, influenced his belief in the universality of inspiration.[3] The treasure of true gnosis might conceivably be turned up in any field. Witness his eager use of Greek literature. Clement had some understanding of a canon of accepted books, but, as stated above, his ultimate criteria consisted of measurements which went beyond the written page.

The second fact is the state of the canon in

---

[1]Eusebius, H.E., VI, xiv.

[2]Cf. F. R. M. Hitchcock, "Did Clement of Alexandria Know the Didaché?" The Journal of Theological Studies, XXIV (1923), 397-401. J. E. L. Outlon, "Clement of Alexandria and the Didaché," The Journal of Theological Studies, XLI (1940), 179.

[3]Cf., e.g., Protr., VI, 71, 1.

Alexandria.[1] Irenaeus and Tertullian in the West represent an awareness, quickened in controversy, for sharp lines and fixed doctrines. Alexandria did not escape this concern, in fact Clement himself is already engaged in active dialogue, but there is an almost naive spirit of freedom. It is as though Christianity is still a wine to be tasted and discovered rather than analyzed and defined. The doctrine of four Gospels and apostolic authority shows that Alexandria is caught up in the catholic concern for canon, but Clement's attitude belies any hard and fast implementation by him of this concern. Even in the time of Origen there appears to be more concern for the Old Testament as a fixed body of literature than for the New. However, it is with Origen, not Clement, that we find our first conclusive evidence that all the books of the New Testament stand on an equal level with the Old Testament. Even then the canon is not as fixed as in the West. Origen, for example, still regards Hermas as "divine Scripture," even though he admits the knowledge that this is not the opinion of the whole Church.[2]

It would be unreasonable to expect a diligent guarding of the letter and word of a text when the text, in and of itself, is not considered the ultimate authority. This does not mean that Scripture was not authoritative for Clement. Scripture may mean the Old Testament accompanied

---

[1]Adolph Harnack, History of Dogma, trans. Neil Buchanan (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1897), II, 60-66.

[2]Origen, Commentary on Matthew, xiv, 21.

by the Gospel and the Apostolic Tradition as exemplified in accepted forms, without necessarily implying the actual words of what has come to be known as the New Testament. It must be remembered that Origen's textual concerns were with the Old Testament.

Thus far, we can conclude only that Clement had a deep reverence and love for Scripture, that he found in it his ultimate source of truth and authority, and that he accepted the principle of Gospel and Apostolic Tradition. On the other hand, Clement had little understanding of a closed canon or of a standard exemplar of that canon. We must delay final judgment on Clement's doctrine of "Scripture" until we investigate his principles of interpretation.[1]

Authority of Scripture

Clement's final authority rested in Scripture. This was true in all of Clement's writings. Scripture was appealed to in arguments of theology or in discussions of the ordinary activities in the life of a Christian.[2] The seeker after truth would not relinquish his search until he had obtained "the proof from the Scriptures themselves."[3] The Lord, through Scripture, is the first principle of

---

[1]Chapters II and III.

[2]Protr., VIII, 77, 1.

[3]Strom., VII, xvi, 93, 1.

instruction:

> For in the Lord we have the first principle of instruction [τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς διδασκαλίας], guiding us to knowledge from first to last [ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰς τόλος] "in divers ways and divers portions" through the prophets and the gospel [διὰ τε τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (note that "gospel" is singular)] and the blessed apostles.[1]

An appeal to Scripture was an appeal to God himself. "Now Jeremiah, the all-wise prophet, or rather the Holy Spirit in Jeremiah, shows what God is."[2]

Scripture thus is seen as the medium of divine truth. In Scripture ὁ λόγος speaks;[3] the words of the prophet are the instruction of ὁ παιδαγωγός;[4] the Psalms are the proclamation of τὸ πνεῦμα.[5] The normal preposition used with the writer of Scripture is διά. Scripture is the medium or vehicle of revelation. This is clearly pointed out in Clement's quotation of John 1:17 ("the law has been given through Moses"). Clement inserts parenthetically: οὐχὶ ὑπὸ Μωσέως, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ μὲν τοῦ λόγου, διὰ Μωσέως δὲ τοῦ θεράποντος αὐτοῦ.[6]

---

[1] Strom., VII, xvi, 95, 3.

[2] Protr., VIII, 78, 1.

[3] E.g., Paed., I, vii, 53, 3.

[4] E.g., Paed., II, x, 95, 2.

[5] E.g., Paed., I, ix, 87, 3.

[6] Paed., I, vii, 60, 1. Cf. Heb. 3:5, καὶ Μωϋσῆς μὲν πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ὡς θεράπων εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων.

Clement's epistemology is built on Scripture.[1] His demonstration (ἀπόδειξις) is not a rational principle but the Word of God. "Accordingly this faith becomes sure demonstration [ἀπόδειξις βεβαία]; since truth follows what has been delivered [παραδοθεῖσιν] by God."[2] The knowledge of the first cause (ἀρχῆς) of the universe is πιστή, not ἀπόδειξις.[3] This first cause, or principle, is the Lord who guides through the prophets and the gospel and the blessed apostles (i.e., through Scripture). If any thing beyond this were needed, the first principle would not be a first principle. Whatever is in need of judgment cannot be an ἀρχή. Therefore, the first cause must be apprehended by faith without demonstration. The demonstration of the first cause is thus obtained from the first cause itself. If proof be demanded then proof is given by the voice of the Lord. This voice is more to be relied on than any demonstration. In fact, it is the only real demonstration.[4] "So too we, obtaining from the Scriptures themselves a perfect demonstration concerning the Scriptures, derive from faith a conviction which has the force of demonstration."[5] "He who believeth then the

---

[1]P. Th. Camelot, Foi et Gnose. Introduction a l' étude de la connaissance mystique chez Clément d' Alexandrie, Vol. III of Etudes de Théologie et d'Histoire de la Spiritualité (Paris: Librarie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1945), pp. 61f.

[2]Strom., VI, viii, 70, 3.

[3]Strom., II, v, 24, 2.

[4]Strom., VII, xvi, 95, 3ff.

[5]Strom., VII, xvi, 96, 1.

divine Scriptures with sure judgment [τὴν κρίσιν βεβαίαν ἔχων], receives in the voice of God, who bestowed the Scriptures, a demonstration that cannot be impugned [ἀπόδειξιν ἀναντίρρητον]. Faith, then, is not established by demonstration."[1]

Clement sought the role of a Christian philosopher. As nearly as possible he followed the methodology of Greek philosophy. Nevertheless, his basic Christian assumption, which he describes as faith, not only furnished him with a new first principle, but permeated his treatment of knowledge. His purpose and audience in teaching made it necessary for him to deal with Greek philosophy, but his concern goes beyond this. He demonstrates a genuine love and interest for philosophy which never really diminished. In spite of all this, he takes a clear and unequivocal stand with regard to his source of knowledge.

> But the Hellenic truth is distinct from that held by us (although it has got the same name), both in respect of extent of knowledge [μεγέθει γνώσεως], certainly of demonstration [ἀποδείξει κυριωτέρα, the authoritative or principle demonstration], divine power [θείᾳ δυνάμει], and the like. For we are taught of God, being instructed in the truly "sacred letters [ἱερὰ γράμματα]" by the Son of God.[2]

Greek philosophy is equated with Paul's παράδοσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων,[3] as over against the Christian's παράδοσις θεία.[4]

---

[1] Strom., II, ii, 9, 6.

[2] Strom., I, xx, 98, 4.

[3] Col. 2:8.

[4] Strom., I, xi, 52, 2f.

Philosophers, then, are children, "slaves of the elemental spirits of the universe,"[1] unless "they have been made men by Christ."[2] Philosophy is an aid in treating truth. The soul must be exercised and prepared. Likewise, there is the practical element (ποιητικόν) of truth. But for those who would deliver the word, "the reading of the Scriptures of the Lord is necessary, in order to the demonstration of what is said [εἰς ἀπόδειξιν τῶν λεγομένων], and especially if those who hear are accessions from Hellenic culture."[3]

Not only is Scripture superior to Greek philosophy, the truth found among the Greeks had its source in Hebrew Scriptures. This theory is not original with Clement. Philo, followed by Justin, had already made the same argument.[4] Clement belabors this point in detail (not always to his credit). He spends an entire chapter[5] drawing up a long list of examples of literary dependence among Greek writers, in an effort to prove that they were basically intellectual thieves. This is followed by another chapter which purports to prove that even the miraculous events of Greek lore were borrowed from the Old Testament.[6] Greek writers are called

---

[1]Gal. 4:3.

[2]Strom., I, xi, 53, 2.

[3]Strom., VI, xi, 91, 1-5.

[4]Philo, Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin III, 5; IV, 152; De Specialibus Legibus IV, 10, 61. Justin, Apology, I, 44.

[5]Strom., VI, ii. [6]Strom., VI, iii.

upon as witnesses to their dependence upon barbaric and older philosophy. Plato confesses that there is no ancient knowledge which originally belonged to the Greeks.[1]

All truth comes from God. Since philosophy contains some truth, it, of necessity, also came from God. Clement takes the statement, "all who came before me were thieves and robbers,"[2] to indicate how those outside the faith show at times an awareness of truth.[3] This statement did not refer to the prophets, since, being sent and inspired by the Lord, they must be considered servants. The devil stole some truth, and, having mixed false prophets with true prophets, mixed his lies with truth. All things dispensed from heaven are good. Thus even in this evil, God has worked good in whatever truth may be found.

> There is then in philosophy, though stolen as the fire of Prometheus, a slender spark, capable of being fanned into flame, a trace of wisdom and an impulse from God. Well, be it so that "the thieves and robbers" are the philosophers among the Greeks, who from the Hebrew prophets before the coming of the Lord received fragments of the truth, not with full knowledge, and claimed these as their own teachings, disguising some points, treating others sophistically by their ingenuity, and discovering other things, for perchance they had "the spirit of perception."[4]

None of this argument was flattering to the Greeks. Clement could have come to such a position only after much

---

[1]Plato, Timaeus, 22 B. Strom., I, xv, 61, 1-69, 3; xxxix, 180, 1-5.

[2]John 10:8.

[3]Strom., I, xvii.

[4]Strom., I, xviii, 87, 1f.

personal pain and sacrifice. Such an insistence could only come from a very strong conviction that the source of all truth and ultimate authority must be Scripture. Clement is adamant at this point. Even the tactics of Miltiades were taken from Moses.[1] Many of Clement's arguments supporting this theory are ridiculous. The approach would tend to alienate the cultured Greek which is the very audience Clement is seeking to win. The theory contradicts Clement's concern for the universal education of mankind by the Logos. In other words, Clement appears willing to make any sacrifice in order to exalt the original and final supremacy of Scripture.

Such a narrow view seems inconsistent, in the light of Clement's heavy use of Greek writings to buttress his arguments. Metrodorus, an Epicurean, for example, is quoted as divinely inspired (ἐνθέως).[2] Plato is often referred to as inspired.[3] Clement can even say of his own writing that "it will be written if God will, and as He inspires [ἤν θεός γε ἐθέλῃ καὶ ὅπως ἄν ἐμπνέῃ].[4] Nevertheless, such treatments do not indicate that Clement placed such inspiration on the same level of authority with Scripture. Because of his two theories of Greek theft of truth and of universal inspiration,

---

[1] Strom., I, xxiv, 162, 2f.

[2] Strom., V, xiv, 138, 2.

[3] E.g., Strom., I, viii, 42, 1.

[4] Strom., IV, i, 3, 4.

Clement felt free to search Greek writings for analogies to the truths of Scripture. This does not make the Greek writings or writers authoritative. Much may be false; some may be true. The truth was judged by the criteria of Scripture which still remains the authority.

Scripture is the utterance of God. The one God and omnipotent Lord was truly preached (γνησίως κεκηρυγμένον) by the law and the prophets and the blessed gospel.[1] The prophets of God were seen as "the organs of the divine voice [ὄργανα θείας φωνῆς]," [2] who were moved "by the power and inspiration of God [δυνάμει θεοῦ καὶ ἐπιπνοίᾳ]." [3] As an utterance of God not "one tittle shall pass away" without being fulfilled, [4] "for the mouth of the Lord, that is, the Holy Spirit hath spoken it." [5] The prophets as sons of God, and the Lord as God's own Son, are qualified, as members of God's own family, to act as "true witnesses respecting divine things." [6] In both the Old and New Testaments it is "God Himself that promulgated the Scriptures by his Son [αὐτὸν τὸν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὰς γραφὰς κηρύξαντα]." [7] The Saviour,

---

[1] Strom., IV, i, 2, 2.

[2] Strom., VI, xviii, 168, 3.

[3] Strom., I, xxi, 135, 3.

[4] Mt. 5:18.

[5] Protr., IX, 82, 1.

[6] Strom., V, xiii, 84, 2. Cf. I Pet. 1:10-11.

[7] Strom., V, xiii, 84, 3; 85, 1.

the Lord, first exhorted men to salvation by wonders and signs in Egypt, and in the desert by the burning bush and the cloud. Afterwards, through Moses and Isaiah and all the company of the prophets, he converted to the Word[1] by more rational means. Finally, "the Word of God speaks, having become man, in order that such as you may learn from man how it is even possible for man to become a god."[2]

Since Scripture is the utterance of God, ultimate authority rests in Scripture and proof from Scripture is final and incontestable. "And is not the demonstration, which we possess, that alone which is true, as being supplied out of the divine Scriptures, the sacred writings, and out of 'God-taught wisdom,' according to the apostle?"[3]

The authority of Scripture is a primary conviction with Clement. It is granted that he shows a remarkable freedom in both his text and his interpretation. Nevertheless, it must be insisted that he never intimates that he is conscious of departing from his authority. Perhaps again at this point there is an indication that for Clement 'Scripture' was not confined to the exact words of our canonical text.

A partial answer concerning authority may be seen in

---

[1] ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον 'word' or 'reason.' For Clement's play upon the double meaning of λόγος see: Butterworth, Clement of Alexandria, p. 20, fn. a.

[2] Protr., I, 8, 1-4. Cf. Wisdom's prophets in successive generations, The Wisdom of Solomon 9:17-11:1.

[3] Strom., II, xi, 48, 3.

Clement's concept of the Covenant. Does he mean by this term two collections of writings, as the present Old and New Testament, or is he primarily concerned with the covenant idea and only incidentally with its written embodiment?

Clement speaks frequently of the two covenants: the Covenant under the Law and the Covenant under the Gospel. Once, using the plural, διαθήκαι, he inserts parenthetically: "or rather the one covenant given at different times."[1] The basic theme of Clement's concept is the idea of God bringing man into a moral relationship with Himself. He is perhaps influenced by Philo who had said: "God Himself is the highest covenant."[2] Thus Clement contends from the passage "Behold my covenant is with you,"[3] that Moses "manifestly calls the Lord a covenant."[4] Clement sees in the four pillars of the Temple "the sign of the sacred tetrad of the ancient covenants [ἁγίας μήνυμα τετράδος διαθηκῶν παλαιῶν]."[5] This is obviously a reference to four covenants, or dispensations, within the Old Testament. Of course it is possible to speak of multiple covenants in the Old Testament and still handle them collectively as one Old Covenant. Nevertheless, διαθήκη

---

[1] Strom., VII, xvii, 107, 5.

[2] Philo, De mutatione nominum, 8.

[3] Gen. 17:4. In Clement: ἰδοὺ ἐγώ, ἡ διαθήκη μου μετὰ σοῦ.

[4] Strom., I, xxix, 182, 2.

[5] Strom., V, vi, 34, 4.

had not for Clement the definite meaning attached today to the term "Testament" as a collection of books.

There is the observable, natural tendency for the meaning of "Covenant" to pass over into the collection of writings which embodied and expressed the term. For example, Clement defends the authority of Paul's writings, in spite of the fact that their author was not one of the twelve disciples, by insisting:

> . . . his writings depend on the Old Testament [ἡ γραφὴ αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἥρτηται διαθήκης], breathing and speaking of them [ἐκεῖθεν, 'thence,' 'from that place,' not necessarily the plural, 'them']. For faith in Christ and the knowledge of the Gospel are the explanation and fulfillment of the law.[1]

The translation, "Old Testament," may not be entirely justified; nevertheless, this use approaches something of the modern use of the term.

Less definite is Clement's remark concerning the twelve stones on the breast of the high priest's robe. These represent not only the zodiac and the changes of the year, but both the law and prophets and also the apostles, "because in both Testaments [καθ' ἑκατέρας τὰς διαθήκας] mention is made of the righteous."[2]

Nothing can really be proved from numerous passages such as Clement's comment on "the mystery hidden for ages and generations":[3]

---

[1] Strom., IV, xxi, 134, 2f.

[2] Strom., V, vi, 38, 5.

[3] Col. 1:26.

> the mysteries which were hid till the time of the apostles, and were delivered by them as they received from the Lord, and, concealed in the Old Testament, were manifested to the saints.[1]

In one instance Clement seems to use διαθῆκαι with the primary sense of two collections of writings. If one be attracted to heretical opinions, one must:

> . . . resort to those who can introduce harmony of opinions, those who can charm the timid and inexperienced with the spell of divine Scriptures, making the truth plain by means of the agreement of the two Testaments.[2]

Clement is speaking here of the theological problem of reconciling the Old and the New Covenants. It is a difficult question in Clement's day and διαθῆκαι could certainly indicate no more than the theological concept of 'Covenants.' The context of this passage, however, would lead to the conclusion that Clement had two bodies of writing in mind. The sixteenth chapter of Stromateis VII is concerned with the problem of different scriptural use and interpretation by Christians and heretics. Thus Clement makes such accusations as the following:

> Wherefore the Scriptures are pregnant to the gnostics, but the heretics, not having examined them, dismiss them as barren.[3]

---

[1] Strom., V, x, 61, 1.

[2] Strom., VII, xvi, 100, 5. And cf. Strom., VII, xvii, 107, 5 cited above in note 1, p. 33: the covenant under the Law and the Covenant under the Gospel, "or rather one covenant given at different times."

[3] Strom., VII, xvi, 94, 3.

> And though it be true that the heretics also have the audacity to make use of the prophetic Scriptures, yet in the first place they do not use them all, and in the second place they do not use them in their entirety . . .[1]

> . . . for after reading the books we commonly use in public, they despised them as worthless--and aiming simply to exceed the common rule of faith, they abandoned the truth.[2]

Controversy with heretics sharpened the Church's concern for the authority of Scripture. Debate demands proof. One popular method of denying the validity of proof was to refuse to recognize the authority of the proof from "books . . . commonly used in public." One crucial point in the heresies of Clement's day concerned the acceptance or rejection of all or parts of the Old Testament. This was a part of the larger question of the "agreement of the Testaments." In this last example Clement is concerned with the agreement of two bodies of literature.

In Alexandria, at the end of the second century, διαθήκη appears to be in a fluid or transitional state. Controversy will continue to crystalize the litera scripta. At present, though the process has begun, Clement is primarily concerned with the spiritual verities which it is the function of the letter to express.

---

[1] Strom., VII, xvi, 96, 2.

[2] Strom., VII, xvi, 97, 3.

CHAPTER II

PRINCIPLES OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION: ALLEGORY

Every interpreter of the Bible brings to his task certain methods and assumptions. The mere fact that he turns to the Bible for corroboration of some thought or argument, or that he should seek for any truth or reality in Scriptures, is indicative that he has assumed some value judgment concerning the contents and thus has arrived at a principle of interpretation concerning the authority of the Bible.[1] The interpretative principles determine how the interpreter will

---

[1] The writer is cognizant of the current criticism which finds its chief expression in replying to Rudolph Bultmann and in particular to his two essays: "The Problem of Hermeneutics," Essays Philosophical and Theological, translated by James C. G. Greig (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1955), pp. 234-61, and "Is Exegesis without Presuppositions Possible?" Existence and Faith, translated by Schubert M. Ogden (New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1960), pp. 289-96. That discussion is primarily concerned with theological presuppositions, and to that extent is not germane to this study. Nevertheless, principles or methodology should not be separated from theology. To approach the Bible historically is to make the assumption that, at least to whatever degree might be maintained, the Bible is a collection of historical documents or that these documents reflect literary responses to history. Even though the reader open the Bible with complete disinterestedness, there is no communication without response, and there is no response which does not imply the individual which the reader brings to the reading.

treat his text.

It is not the purpose of this study to investigate all of Clement's principles. Only those which could influence his attitude toward the actual text of his New Testament will here be discussed. In the previous chapter Clement's canon and his understanding of scriptural authority were treated in an effort to delineate what was his Bible. It should now be recognized that both of these factors also constitute principles of his interpretation.

Allegory

Allegory is employed by Clement more extensively than any other principle of interpretation. For the sake of convenience, this section will consider Clement's principle of ascertaining metaphorical meanings beyond the obvious sense of the text, even though his methodology or results could be more strictly classified. This broad classification is used not only in the interest of brevity but in the hope that its utilization will render a clearer understanding of a rather complex problem.

Examples of Clement's utilization of metaphorical meanings from the Old Testament, the Gospels, and Paul are here presented first, as background for the discussion which follows.

Clement recognized the Logos throughout the Old

Testament. He sees it in the blood of Abel,[1] not only because it was just; but also because it cried to God it must be the Logos, in that it is able to make a plea.[2]

The changing of the name 'Abram' to 'Abraham' (Ἀβράμ to Ἀβραάμ)[3] is interpreted as a change in meaning from 'sublime father' to 'elect father of sound' (πατὴρ ἐκλεκτὸς ἠχοῦς). The earlier name signified his vocation of pursuing the "sublime philosophy of the movement of the heavens." Upon seeing in the heavens "the Son in the spirit" he received the addition of the Alpha, "the knowledge of the one and only God," and thus became not just a φιλόσοφος but a φιλόθεος. Thus, his new name is bestowed. "For by sound is the uttered word: the mind is its father, and the mind of the good man is elect."[4]

A further understanding through name interpretation is found in the account of Abimelech's discovery of "Isaac fondling Rebekah his wife."[5] To Clement, the king represents a wisdom above this world "looking down upon the mystery signified by such childlike playing (κατασκοποῦσα τῆς παιδιᾶς τὸ μυστήριον). 'Isaac' which means 'rejoicing (γέλως)' and

---

[1]Gen. 4:10; cf. Heb. 11:4.

[2]Paed., I, vi, 47, 3f.

[3]Gen. 17:5.

[4]Strom., V, ii, 8, 6f.; cf. Philo, De Cherubim, 4, 7.

[5]Gen. 26:8. LXX: Ἰσαὰκ παίζοντα.

'Rebekah' which means 'submission (ὑπομονή)' render the metaphor of "rejoicing joined to submission, with the king as audience." The intimate play of marriage is transformed to merry-making in Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ παιδίων) which is godly childlikeness (θεία παιδιά).[1]

From Jacob's blessing upon Judah Clement picks up the image of the colt tied to the vine.[2] This is transformed to mean that the simple, new people (the colt) are united to the Word (the vine). The people are designated as colts to indicate that they are unyoked to evil, unsubdued by wickedness, but rather free and newly born, joyous in faith and trampling upon worldliness. The Word is the vine since the product of the Word is blood and that of the vine is wine. Both are "saving potions" (ποτὸν εἰς σωτηρίον): the wine for the body, the blood for the soul.[3]

The song of victory commemorating the destruction of Egypt's forces in the Red Sea ("the horse and his rider he has thrown into the sea")[4] becomes an ode celebrating the casting into the disorders of the world the horse of lust (ἐπιθυμία) along with the rider who gives the reins to pleasure.[5]

---

[1] Paed., I, v, 21, 3f. Cf. Philo, De Plantatione, 169f.

[2] Gen. 49:11.

[3] Paed., I, v, 15, 1-3.

[4] Ex. 15:1, 21.

[5] Strom., V, ix, 52, 5. Cf. Plato, Phaedrius, 247 B; Philo, De Somniis, II, 267; 269f.; De Agricultura, 82f.; Legum Allegoria, II, 99.

The Gnostic is exhorted to seek knowledge in all things. Among examples of meaningful truth in unexpected places the measurements of the table for the bread of Presence is cited. The table is two cubits in length, a cubit in breadth, and a cubit and a half in height.[1] The perimeter of the table top yields a sum of six cubits. The four legs, each of a cubit and a half, yield a sum of six cubits. The total measurements thus calculated render the figure of twelve cubits agreeable to the twelve months of the year. The table also exhibits an image of the earth in that its four feet constitute the four seasons of the year.[2]

The apostasy of the golden calf[3] furnishes the women of Clement's day with a lesson on the advantages of laying ornaments aside.[4]

The injunction to consider clean only those animals who both chew the cud and part the hoof[5] mystically distinguishes as unclean the Jews and heretics. The parted hoof represents the Father and the Son; the chewing of the cud is a figurative description of the studying by day and by night of the oracles of God. The Jews chew the cud but have no

---

[1]Ex. 25:23.

[2]Strom., VI, xi, 87, 3f. Cf. Philo, De Opificio Mundi, 52.

[3]Ex. 32:1-6.

[4]Paed., II, xii, 126, 2.

[5]Lev. 11:3ff.

firm footing of the faith which carries them to the Father through the Son. The heretics take their stand on the name of the Father and of the Son but fail in their study of the oracles.[1]

The admonition to refrain from the practices of Egypt and Canaan[2] is understood as a warning to abstain from the world and deceit.[3]

The prohibition against yoking together the ox and the ass[4] teaches that it is wrong to bring under the yoke one of another race simply on the ground that he is of another race. It also indicates that the Word should not be shared equally with both the believer and the unbeliever; the ox is clean, but the ass is unclean.[5]

David's description of the queen clothed in gold standing at the right hand[6] is a picture of the Church.[7]

Jeremiah is called to witness a proof that the senseless and disobedient are called 'earth'[8] in the Scripture.[9]

---

[1] Strom., VII, xviii, 109, 1-6.

[2] Lev. 18:1-5.

[3] Strom., II, X, 46, 1-3. Cf. Philo, De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia, 86.

[4] Deut. 22:10.

[5] Strom., II, xviii, 94, 4f. Cf. Philo, De Virtutibus, 146f.

[6] Ps. 45:9, 13f.

[7] Strom., VI, xi, 92, 1.

[8] Jer. 22:29f.

[9] Strom., IV, xxvi, 168, 3.

From even this small number of examples given above of Clement's allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, it is quite clear that Clement is relying heavily upon the methods and even the results of Philo's exegesis. He is thus employing a common and acceptable principle of interpretation in Alexandria.

Upon turning to the New Testament, Clement continues the same freedom of interpretation which he had inherited from Old Testament usage.

The foxes who have holes[1] are those "evil and earthly men who are occupied about the wealth which is mined and dug from the ground."[2]

The weeds among the wheat[3] show a prophecy of the Lord that the seeds of heresy would be sown upon the truth.[4]

The pearl of great value[5] is the Word of God, Jesus "in all His splendor and purity," "the contemplating eye in the flesh [τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐποπτην ὀφθαλμόν]," through whom human nature is born again and receives "great new value."[6]

The grain of mustard[7] bites the soil and grows magnificently in it, to such a degree that "the reason of things sublime rest on it [ἐπαναπαύεσθαι αὐτῇ τοὺς περὶ τῶν

---

[1] Mt. 8:20; Lk. 9:58.

[2] Strom., IV, vi, 31, 2.

[3] Mt. 13:25.

[4] Strom., VII, xv, 89, 4.

[5] Mt. 13:46.

[6] Paed., II, xii, 188, 5.

[7] Mt. 17:20; Lk. 17, 6.

μεταρσίων λόγους]."[1]

The fish with the shekel in its mouth[2] illustrates the ease of gaining the necessary food given by God. In taking the shekel from the fish Peter was ridding those who rise from out the water of all extravagance and love of money.[3]

The two or three gathered in the name of Jesus[4] are the family of husband, wife, and child. Again, the three are passion, desire, and thought; or flesh, soul, and spirit. Further the three may mean the called, the chosen, and the race appointed to receive the greatest honor. It might also indicate the one Church, the one man, and the one race. Or finally, it suggests the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel brought together in Christ's name into a single knowledge.[5]

The night in the parable of the ten maidens is the great darkness of ignorance. The wise virgins are the wise souls who "kindle the light, and rouse the mind, and illumine the darkness, and dispel ignorance, and seek truth, and await the appearance of the teacher."[6]

The anointing of the feet of Jesus[7] creates some embarrassment for Clement since he is much opposed to the use of any perfume. This act is excused by the fact that the

---

[1] Strom., V, i, 3, 1.

[2] Mt. 17:27.

[3] Paed., II, i, 14, 1.

[4] Mt. 18:20.

[5] Strom., III, x, 68, 1-70, 4.

[6] Strom., V, iii, 17, 3.

[7] Mt. 26:6-13; Lk. 7:36-50 (cf. Mk. 14:3-9; Jn. 12:3-8).

woman was still a sinner and only brought what she considered to be her most precious possession. The anointing of the feet suggests the divine teaching "whose good odor and fame have spread to the ends of the earth." The anointed feet are the apostles who journeyed about the whole earth preaching the Gospel. The tears are repentance, and the unloosed hair is conversion from the love of finery. Here may also be seen a symbol of the suffering of the Master. The oil (τὸ ἔλαιον) is the Lord from whom we receive mercy (τὸ ἔλεος). Myrrh, a diluted oil, is the traitor Judas. The tears are sinners who have repented. The unloosed hair is desolate Jerusalem in mourning.[1]

The crown of thorns on the head of Jesus[2] is rich in allegorical meanings. It is a figure of ourselves who were once barren, "but now encircle Him as a garland through His Church, of which He is the head." It is a type of our faith: "it is a type of life, through the substance of wood; of joy, because it is a crown; of trial, because it is a crown of thorns, and no one can approach the Word without shedding blood." It is a symbol of victory, for at the time it was used Jesus was carrying upon His head all our sins thus saving us and bringing us victory over death. Finally, it is a symbol of the unity of God's work and Word. When first God made manifest His word, it was in a thorn bush.

---

[1] Paed., II, viii, 61, 1-63, 1.

[2] Mt. 27:29; Mk. 15:17; Jn. 19:2.

"So, too, when the Word was concluding His legislation and His stay among men as their Lord, again He permitted Himself to be crowned with thorns as a mystic symbol."[1]

The mother and father which we are to leave for the sake of the gospel[2] indicated the gnostic martyrdom of leaving "his worldly kindred, and wealth, and every possession, in order to lead a life free from passion." 'Mother' figuratively means country and sustenance; 'father' means the laws of civil polity.[3]

The dumbness of Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, which lasted until the birth of the forerunner of the Christ[4] was, in its hidden meaning, the mystic silence (τὴν μυστικὴν σιωπήν)of the dark prophetic sayings awaiting their becoming good tidings through the inbreaking of the light of truth.[5]

The good Samaritan[6] is none other than the Savior himself who comes fully equipped for man's need with "wine, oil, bandages, a beast, and payment." We are those who have been done almost to death with wounds of "fears, lusts, wraths, griefs, deceits, and pleasures." Jesus does not deal

---

[1] Paed., II, viii, 73, 3-72, 2.

[2] Mk. 10:29f.; Mt. 19:29.

[3] Strom., IV, iv, 15, 4-6.

[4] Lk. 1:20, 64.

[5] Protr., I, 10, 1.

[6] Lk. 10:29-37.

with the surface of the wounds as does the Law but cuts out the passions from the very root. He pours over our wounded souls the wine, the blood of David's vine,[1] and lavishes on us "the oil of pity from the Father's heart [τὸ ἔλαιον τὸν ἐκ σπλάγχνων πατρὸς ἔλεον]." He shows us the unbreakable bands[2] of health and salvation, "love, faith and hope." He orders the angels and principalities and powers to serve us for "great reward,"[3] for "they too shall be freed from the vanity of the world at the revelation of the glory of the sons of God."[4]

The five barley loaves and two fish[5] are the preparatory training of the Jews and Greeks previous to the divine grain. "Barley is sooner ripe for harvest than wheat." The fish are Hellenistic philosophy produced and moved in the midst of the gentile billow. One fish indicated the curriculum of study, and the other the philosophy which supervenes.[6]

The Christian is warned against the ostentatiousness of long, flowing robes. The seamless robe of Jesus,[7] which Clement understands as multicolored, really represents "the

---

[1]Cf. Lk. 10:34 and The Didaché, ix, 1f.

[2]τοὺς δεσμοὺς ἀλύτους. Cf. Lk. 10:34, κατέδησεν.

[3]ἐπὶ μεγάλῳ μισθῷ. Cf. Lk. 10:35, ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαί με ἀποδώσω σοι.

[4]QDS, 28, 1-29, 6.

[5]Jn. 6:9-11.

[6]Strom., VI, xi, 94, 2-5.

[7]Jn. 19:23.

brilliance of wisdom, the manifold and unfading value of Scripture, words of the Lord that glow with rays of truth."[1]

Clement builds on Paul's symbol of the gentiles as a wild olive shoot grafted in the olive tree[2] by treating metaphorically the facts of grafting. The first method of grafting is to fit the shoot between the wood and the bark. This is the instruction for simple people who receive the word superficially. The second method is to split the cultivated branch and to insert the shoot. This applies both to the philosopher whose dogmas are cut through thus producing acknowledgment of truth, and to the Jew by opening up the Old Testament and inserting the new and noble plant. The third method involves laying bare both shoots to the pith and then binding the two together. Thus are the uncultivated and heretics brought by violence to the truth. The fourth method is budding (ἐνοφθαλμισμός) in which the bud (ὀφθαλμός) is inserted into the trunk of the tree. "This is the style [εἶδος] of gnostic teaching, which is capable of looking into things themselves."[3]

An excellent example of Clement's exegetical treatment of Paul is found in his discussion of I Corinthians 3:1, 2.[4]

---

[1] Paed., II, x, 113, 3. For Joseph's multicolored robe, see Strom., V, viii, 53, 2 and 4.

[2] Rom. 11:17.

[3] Strom., VI, xv, 117, 2-120, 2.

[4] Paed., I, xv, 34, 3-52, 3.

The heretics insisted that they had received the perfection (τὸ τέλειον) which was not available to all Christians. Clement himself distinguishes between levels of knowledge, but he insists upon the orthodox view that salvation comes equally to all through faith. "When we are baptized, we are enlightened; being enlightened, we become adopted sons; becoming adopted sons, we are made perfect; and becoming perfect, we are made divine."[1] He denies that some are enlightened Gnostics and others Spirituals (ψυχικοί) in the same Word.[2] He thus argues that all Christians should consider themselves as νήπιοι, as παῖδες τοῦ θεοῦ.[3] This appears to be in contradiction to Paul's statement: But I, brethren could not address you as spiritual men [ὡς πνευματικοῖς] but as men of the flesh [ἀλλ' ὡς σαρκίνοις], as babes in Christ [ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ]. I fed you with milk, not solid food; for you were not ready for it; and even yet you are not ready." Such a passage would fit in admirably with the gnostic interpretations of the heretics.[4] Clement turns the meaning to his purpose so that it becomes a proof against varieties of Christian status. Properly interpreted the verse should be read (according to Clement): ⟩γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα ἐν Χριστῷ⟨ [I Corinthians reads: ⟩ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ. γάλα ὑμᾶς

---

[1] Paed., I, vi, 26, 1.

[2] Paed., I, vi, 31, 2.

[3] Paed., I, vi, 32, 4.

[4] See also: I Cor. 15:44, ⟩σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν.⟨

ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα[ς]. The ὡς should indicate that a metaphor (παραβολή) is being used. The reading would then mean: 'I have instructed you in Christ, who is the simple and true and real spiritual nourishment [κατήχησα ὑμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ ἁπλῇ καὶ ἀληθεῖ καὶ αὐτοφυεῖ τροφῇ τῇ πνευματικῇ].' Christ the Word is the life-giving milk (ἡ τοῦ γάλακτος ζωοτρόφος).[1] Milk is perfection (τὸ τέλειον) because it is the perfect food (τελεία τροφή) which leads to perfection (εἰς τέλος).[2]

The words, "not solid food; for you were not ready for it," signifies, not a higher state of man, but the full revelation, face to face, in the world to come.[3]

Milk cannot be thought of as primary instruction over against meat (βρῶμα) as spiritual knowledge equated with the body and blood (σάρκα καὶ αἷμα) of Jesus. Γάλα, σάρκα, and αἷμα are identical substance. The blood of the mother feeds the embryo of the child, producing flesh. Blood is then a sort of fluid flesh (ὑγρὰ σάρξ). After childbirth the blood turns to the breasts where it appears as milk.[4] Blood in becoming milk changes in its qualities, but not in its substance (κατὰ ποιότατα, οὐ κατ' οὐσίαν). This milk is similar in every way to spiritual food (πνευματικὴ τροφή): "by its nature it is palatable through grace, nourishing, for it is

---

[1]Paed., I, vi, 35, 2f.

[2]Paed., I, vi, 36, 1.

[3]Paed., I, vi, 36, 5f.

[4]Paed., I, vi, 39, 1-5.

life; and dazzling white, for it is the light of Christ." Thus, τὸ αἷμα τοῦ λόγου has been revealed as γάλα.[1]

Clement goes on to show that the Word is spoken of as solid food, flesh, nourishment, bread, blood, milk, and wine. Under whatever terminology it is the Word upon which we are fed.

A final example of the free handling of Paul's text indicates clearly how Clement was capable of reversing the natural meaning of a passage without changing a single word of the passage under consideration. He seeks to prove that the highest wisdom is not for 'every man,' by the simple expedient of changing the sense to 'all man.' Paul has stated: ⟩νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ .⟨[2] Clement turns the meaning to his own use by adding: "not every man simply [οὐ ⟩πάντα⟨ ἁπλῶς ⟩ἄνθρωπον⟨], since no one would be unbelieving. Nor does he call every man who believes in Christ perfect [οὐδὲ μὴν ⟩πάντα⟨ τὸν πιστεύοντα ⟩τέλειν ἐν Χρσιτῷ⟨]; but he says all the man [⟩πάντα ἄνθρωπον⟨], as if he said the whole man [ὡς εἰπεῖν ὅλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον], as if purified in body and soul."[3]

If, as the above examples indicate, Clement felt such freedom of interpretation was legitimate, then either there would be no necessity to change the wording of his text to

---

[1] Paed., I, vi, 40, 2.

[2] Col. 1:28.

[3] Strom., V, x, 61, 3f.

accommodate his theology or else he possessed some criteria which permitted him to both interpret freely and quote freely the New Testament. For this reason it is important to understand the purpose and the reasoning which motivated Clement's metaphorical or symbolic interpretation.

Clement did not understand interpretation as reading his own views into the text. Though the above examples may appear fanciful to the modern reader, Clement was completely sincere in his exegesis. Origen was later to defend allegory as a method for determining truth from Scripture; Clement was content to accept allegory as the tradition which he had received.[1] During the Old Testament period, he held there was much that was "unwritten, because not yet known." But now that the Savior has taught the apostles, "the unwritten rendering of the written [ἡ τῆς ἐγγράφου ἄγραφος] has been handed down also to us [ἤδη καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς διαδίδοται παράδοσις] . . . according to the renovation of the book [κατὰ τὴν ἀνακαίνωσιν τοῦ βιβλίου]."[2] Thus Clement understood all his teaching as traditional elucidation of the higher meaning behind the text. For this reason fidelity to the true tradition was of far greater significance than controlled

---

[1]Charles Bigg, The Christian Platonists of Alexandria (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1886), pp. 57, 134-51.

[2]Strom., Vi, xv, 131, 4f. As translated by Wilson in The Ante-Nicene Fathers, II. Perhaps more clearly: "the oral tradition of Scripture is being handed down also to us, having been inscribed by the power of God upon new hearts according to the renewal of the book."

methodology of allegory. Since Clement was chiefly concerned with the gnosis which was not immediately apparent in the bare text, then the exact text may not receive the same degree of concern as the exact elucidation. It is readily apparent that if this is Clement's view, allegory as a principle of interpretation has a direct bearing on his attitude and use of the New Testament text. It is also proper to note, in passing, that Clement's treatment of allegory helps to make clear his understanding of what is Scripture. All Christian teaching and practice become an elucidation of Scripture.

Clement was deeply indebted to his Hellenistic environment for his acceptance of the principle of allegory and for the allegorical method. Greek education was transmissive in its concern to preserve the ancient heritage of its myths. Homer, along with the other ancient poets, constituted a national anthology for the training of Greece's youth. With the development of speculative thought in the fifth century, both the training of the philosopher and the demands on the teacher required the formulation of later reflections within the framework of the ancient myths. A reverence for both the early writings and the ancient poets made easy the assumption that the myth-makers were concerned to edify and instruct. Therefore, even in offensive passages the inclination was to seek beneath the surface of the traditional tales for a relevant and edifying significance. J.

Tate[1] has insisted that allegory did not arise as a negative defense of the poetic traditions, but as a natural effort to exploit the wealth of doctrine which the Greeks believed the myths to contain. This does not preclude the use of the allegorical method by later writers who sought to defend the early poets. Johannes Munck has pointed out a further use of allegory: as Greek thought lost its independence and early creative force, the ancient authority of poetry and myth grew in importance as sources of practical wisdom. Hellenism surrendered its brave hope of attaining a rational world interpretation. The poets attained the rank of sacred philosophers.[2] It is on this very ground that Clement feels the necessity of proving that both the Greek philosophers and poets received their truths from the Hebrews.[3] Philosophy is understood as poetry, bereft of form but graced with clarity. The only true differences between poetry and philosophy are age and form.

Plato in particular, among the philosophers, was Clement's mentor. With Plato all truth is divinely inspired even though truth be of two levels. Right opinion (ὀρθὴ

---

[1]J. Tate, "Plato and Allegorical Interpretation," The Classical Quarterly, XXIII (1929), 142.

[2]Johannes Munck, Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandria (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte, Herausgegeben von Erich Seebert, Erich Casper, Wilhelm Weber, Zweiter Band. Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933), pp. 213f.

[3]Strom., V, xiv.

δόξα), or true opinion (ἀληθὴς δόξα) is different from knowledge (ἐπιστήμη). Yet right opinion will render "the effect of each action as good as knowledge does." Thus, "right opinion will be no whit inferior to knowledge in worth or usefulness as regards our actions, nor will the man who has right opinion be inferior to him who has knowledge."[1] A poet may fail to possess knowledge and yet "utter many a true thing when inspired, but have no knowledge of anything they say." Such may also be called "divine [θείους] and enraptured [ἐνθουσιάζειν], as being inspired and possessed of God [ἐπίπνους ὄντας καὶ κατεχομένους ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ] when they succeed in speaking many great things, while knowing nought of what they say."[2] The poets may not even be aware of the truth which they utter: "What they composed they composed not by wisdom [οὐ σοφίᾳ], but by nature [ἀλλὰ φύσει] and because they were inspired [ἐνθουσιάζοντες], like the prophets and givers of oracles."[3] A state of possession [κατοκωχή] and madness [μανία]" comes from the Muses. "This takes hold [λαβοῦσα] upon a gentle and pure soul, arouses it [ἐγείρουσα] and inspires it [ἐκβακχεύουσα, 'excites to Bacchic frenzy'] to

---

[1]Plato, Meno, 98, B, C.

[2]Plato, Meno, 99, C, D.

[3]Plato, The Apology, 22, C. Cf. Meno, 99 E: "virtue is found to be neither natural nor taught [οὔτε φύσει οὔτε διδακτόν], but is imparted to us by a divine dispensation without understanding in those who receive it [ἀλλὰ θείᾳ μοίρᾳ παραγιγνομένη ἄνευ νοῦ, οἷς ἂν παραγίγνηται]."

songs and other poetry, and thus by adorning countless deeds of the ancients educates [παιδεύει] later generations."[1]

The task of the interpreter is not to ask the poet what he meant by his verses. The latter simply has no 'knowledge of what he himself has said. The intent of the poet and the true meaning are two quite different things. The task of the interpreter is to ascertain the truth which the poet unwittingly recorded. In this light, allegory is not moralizing on a fable.[2] It must be admitted that Plato does not hold the poets in high esteem. Nevertheless, he does express the justification by which allegory maintained a deeper meaning in the myths quite apart from the poet's intention. It will remain only for Clement to substitute the Logos for the Muses and the sacred Christian writings for the Greek poets. Biblical exegesis will become an avenue to 'knowledge,' or, as Clement prefers, to 'gnosis.' Clement demonstrates his agreement with the above in the following statement:

> But those, taught in theology by those prophets, the poets, philosophize much by way of a hidden sense [δι' ὑπονοίας πολλὰ φιλοσοφοῦσι]. I mean Orpheus, Linus, Musaeus, Homer, and those in this fashion wise. The persuasive style of poetry is for them a veil for the many [παραπέτασμα δὲ αὐτοῖς πρὸς τοὺς πολλούς]. Dreams and signs [ὄνειροί τε καὶ σύμβολα] are all more or less obscured [ἀφανέστερα] to men, not from jealousy (for it were wrong to conceive of God as subject to passions), but in order that research [ἡ ζήτησις], introducing [παρεισδύουσα, (penetrating)] to the understanding of enigmas [εἰς τὴν τῶν αἰνιγμάτων ἔνοιαν (better, 'intent,' 'design,'

---

[1]Plato, Phaedrus, 245, A.

[2]See J. Tate, pp. 149f. for a full discussion.

'sense')] may haste to the discovery of truth [ἐπὶ τὴν εὕρεσιν τῆς ἀληθείας].[1]

The conquests of Alexander brought the Greek world face to face with the various religions of the Near East. The followers of these faiths sought to re-evaluate their ancient beliefs under the impact of Hellenistic thought and to both defend and propagate their religions. These followers found themselves in a situation somewhat analogous to the fifth-century Greek in their reverence for their ancient myths and the demand for relevance in their new world of thought. Judaism and the Judeo-Christian faith should not be seen as an isolated phenomenon. Along with the other barbaric faiths of the Hellenistic world, a bridge of allegory was erected between the ancient form of knowledge and the new form of Greek abstraction. If the Judeo-Christian faith were to justify itself in the Hellenistic world, then its barbaric content must be translated into the current philosophical framework just as surely as the language must be translated into the Greek. The pressing translational need was the conversion from the "popular proclamation into a more philosophical doctrine."[2]

---

[1] Strom., V, iv, 24, 1f.

[2] Munck, p. 218. Cf. Eugène de Faye, Clément d'Alexandria; Étude sur les Rapports du Christianisme et de la Philosophie Grecque au IIe Siècle (Paris: Ernest Le Roux, 1898), pp. 99f.: "Les philosophes grecs possédaient un puissant instrument de pensée. C'était la dialectique. Socrate, Platon, Aristote, Chrysippe en avaient fait une méthode savante à l'usage de tous ceux qui voulaiente philosopher. Par l'application de la dialectique, les chefs d'école arrivaient à formuler, en des terms très précis, leurs

The transfer from the barbaric world to the Greek was not made without loss. For the Greek the spiritual was hidden in the sensible, but the sensible might act only as a vessel to contain the spiritual without any natural rapport. There was thus no intrinsic connection between the two meanings to control which spiritual reality ought to be signified. This not only permitted a license in interpretation, but often led to superficial treatment of the interpretative materials. The above example of Clement's interpretation of I Corinthians 3:1, 2[1] illustrates how an Alexandrian was capable of intricate discussion regarding the connections between milk, blood, and the Word, without ever considering the deeper spiritual symbolism or sacramental meaning. The same superficiality is seen in the treatment of history. History is not so much seen as a vehicle of revelation as it is rejected for a higher meaning. In its deepest meaning there is no vital understanding of the relationship of revelation and incarnation. Spiritual truth is not incarnate in the sensible. It is almost as though two sets of truths are received: the one sensible, the other spiritual. The task of interpretation would then be the proper matching of these two given sets of

---

vues sur les differents sujets qui faisaient alors l'objet de la philosophie. Une fois fixés, ces termes ne variaient guére. C'est ainsi que les principales idées de chaque école se cristallisaient pour ainsi dire en formules à peu près immutables qui constituaient comme la marque de fabrique du système. On les appelait des δόγματα."

[1]Paed., I, vi.

truths. This appears to be exactly what some heretical interpreters practiced.

Clement's methodology is often closely akin to the practice of heretical interpreters. Yet, in spite of his avowed aim of stating Christianity in philosophical terms, he rarely departs from orthodox Christianity in his conclusions. It seems evident that he possessed and carefully guarded a spiritual tradition with its demands for a traditional interpretation. It would be absurd to suppose that Clement would have arrived at the particular interpretations which he offers if he had relied solely upon his methodology. By this statement is not meant so much the allegorical analogies which he draws as the fact that he often displays orthodox views which could only rest ultimately in Jewish understandings of such matters as sacred history, incarnation, and revelation. Such views would not result from Clement's interpretative presuppositions or methods.

There is no doubt of the direct influence of Philo on Clement's treatment of the Old Testament.[1] Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that a clear case can be made for Clement's

---

[1]See especially: Paul Heinish, Der Einfluss Philos auf die älteste Christliche Exegese; Barnabas, Justin und Clemens von Alexandria (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen. Herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. J. Nikel, Heft 1/2. Münster i. W.: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Buchhandlung, 1908). Cf. Émile Bréhier, Les Idées Philosophiques et Religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie (Études de Philosophie Médiévale, VIII. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1950), pp. 35-66, and Harry Austryn Wolfson, Philo; Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948), I, 87-199.

direct borrowing from Philo,[1] there was a far greater Jewish and Christian tradition of interpretation within which Philo should be seen as only one, although an important, witness. Judaism had been exposed in varying degrees to Hellenism long before Philo began to write. Judaism both in Palestine and in the diaspora had presented for a long time a favorable milieu for metaphorical interpretation. Two presuppositions especially encouraged this method: the insistence that "Scripture in all its parts, even in its smaller details, is full of sacred teachings, moral and dogmatic," and that "in the Bible, it is never possible to have anything of insignificance or unusefulness, anything of offensiveness."[2] Thus Clement inherited through Judaism and Christianity a rich legacy of traditional interpretation which though influenced and often accommodated to Hellenistic thought, nevertheless preserved the distinctive point of view which orthodoxy demanded. Clement exhibits no interest in historical facts as such; they are mentioned only because they constitute the sensible within which the spiritual was hidden. Yet he accepts the covenant idea which is rooted in historical concern, and readily makes such dogmatic statements as: "For, in truth, the covenant of salvation, reaching

---

[1]Cf. as illustrative of this common practice with Clement the following footnotes within this chapter: p. 39, fn. 4; p. 40, fns 1, 5; p. 41, fn. 2; p. 42, fns. 3, 5.

[2]P. Th. Camelot, p. 72. For an overview of this whole problem see: Werner Jaeger, Early Christianity and Greek Paideia (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961), pp. 36-67.

down to us from the foundation of the world, through different generations and times, is one."[1]

In a similar manner Clement may appear to identify Christ with Wisdom in such statements as:

> If then, we assert that Christ Himself is Wisdom, and that it was His working which showed itself in the prophets, by which the gnostic tradition may be learned, as He Himself taught the apostles during His presence; then it follows that the gnosis, which is the knowledge and apprehension of things present, future, and past, which is sure and reliable, as being imparted and revealed by the Son of God, is wisdom.[2]

However, Clement does not confine his Logos to the immanent, divine power in the world. The believer "sees intellectual objects and future things with the mind [τῷ νῷ ὁρᾷ νοητὰ καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα]." Such intellectual objects are ideas (ἰδέαι) which Christians "have termed the Word of God." This Word became flesh "that he might be seen [ἵνα καὶ θεαθῇ]."[3] More importantly, the Word of God became man "for the sake of man [διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον]," [4] and "has saved mankind by shedding His blood for us."[5] In such instances, of which there are many, Clement demonstrates a controlling influence on his thought and interpretation which denies to him the expected results of his logic. The rationale of Clement's allegory

---

[1] Strom., VI, xiii, 106, 3.

[2] Strom., VI, vii, 61, 1.

[3] Strom., V, iii, 16, 1-5.

[4] Paed., I, viii, 74, 4.

[5] Paed., I, vi, 43, 3.

was Hellenistic; the purpose of his allegory was the translation of a barbaric religion into Hellenistic thought patterns and terminology; the results of his allegory were determined, not by allegorical methodology, but by traditional interpretation.

As indicated above, Clement saw two sets of truths in Scripture: the sensible and the spiritual; an external and an inward sense. Thus Joshua saw two Moseses, the one with the angels, the other being buried in the ravines of the mountains. Caleb saw only the Moses who was buried. This story would indicate that "knowledge is not the privilege of all [μὴ πάντων εἶναι τὴν γνῶσιν]." Some look at "the body of the Scriptures [τὸ σῶμα τῶν γραφῶν], the expressions and the names as to the body of Moses; while others see through to the thoughts [τὰς διανοίας] and what is signified by the names, seeking the Moses that is with the angels."[1] So also Clement comments on Mark 10:17-31:

> And as we are clearly aware that the Saviour teaches His people nothing in a merely human [ἀνθρωπίνως] way, but everything by a divine and mystical wisdom [ἀλλὰ πάντα θείᾳ σοφίᾳ καὶ μυστικῇ], we must not understand His words literally [σαρκίνως], but with due inquiry and intelligence [μετὰ ἀξίας ζητέσεως καὶ συνέσεως] we must search out and master their hidden meaning [κεκρυμμένον νοῦν]. For the sayings which appear to have been simplified by the Lord Himself to His disciples are found even now, on account of the extraordinary degree of wisdom in them, to need not less but more attention than His dark and suggestive utterances. And when the sayings which are thought to have been fully explained by Him to the inner circle of disciples, to the very

---

[1] Strom., VI, xvi, 132, 3.

> men who are called of the kingdom, still require further reflexion, surely those that had the appearance of being delivered in simple form and for that reason were not questioned by the hearers, but which are of importance for the whole end of salvation, and are enveloped [ἐσκεπασμένα] in a wonderful [θαυμαστῷ] and super-celestial [ὑπερουρανίῳ] depth of thought [διανοίας βάθει], should not be taken as they strike the careless ear, but with an effort of mind to reach the very spirit of the Saviour and His secret meaning [τὸ τῆς γνώμης ἀπόρρητον].[1]

The real meaning lies behind the veil as the architecture of the Temple so fittingly symbolizes.[2]

Claude Mondesert[3] classifies the senses offered by Clement's exegesis as follows: (1) historical, (2) doctrinal, (3) prophetic, (4) philosophical, and (5) mystical.

(1) The historical sense[4] is concerned with social, religious, and political facts. For example, Clement answers the heretics who quote, "They resisted God and were saved,"[5] as authority for seeking salvation through resistance, by arguing that the prophets in uttering their oracles "do not only say that they have heard some message from God; it is also evident that they take up phrases in common use among

---

[1] QDS, 5, 2-4.

[2] Strom., V, vi, 33, 2.

[3] Claude Mondésert, Clément d'Alexandrie: Introduction à l'étude de sa pensée religieuse à partir de l'Ecriture (Théologie, Études publiées sous la direction de la Faculté de Théologie S. J. de Lyon-Fourvière, IV, Paris: Aubier, 1944), pp. 63-183. See also Walter J. Burghardt, "On Early Christian Exegesis," Theological Studies, XI (1950), 191f.

[4] Mondésert, pp. 155f.

[5] Mal. 3:15.

the people and reply to them, as if they were reporting certain questions raised by them."[1] Such a sense is often given to the facts of biblical history and to details of the life of Jesus.

(2) The doctrinal sense[2] may be moral, religious, or theological. An example of this usage has already been seen in Clement's interpretation[3] of the anointing of the feet of Jesus.[4] A theological doctrinal interpretation finds the Paidagogos who is the Logos[5] in the man who wrestled with Jacob.[6]

(3) The prophetic sense[7] may be messianic or religious. It is messianic if the prophecy is concerned with the Christ. The text may be understood as strictly prophetic with only the messianic sense possible. Thus Clement interprets the "shoot from the stump of Jesse":[8] "The name that He has tells us by divine inspiration that the Educator will save. It is for this reason that the Scripture associates Him with a rod that suggests correction, government, and sovereignty."[9]

---

[1] Strom., III, iv, 38, 1-5.

[2] Mondésert, p. 156.

[3] Paed., II, viii, 61, 1-63, 1.

[4] Mt. 26:6-13; Lk. 7:36-50 (cf. Mk. 14:3-9; Jn. 12:3-8).

[5] Paed., I, vii, 57, 1. Cf. Philo, De mut. nom., 87.

[6] Gen. 32:33-32.

[7] Mondésert, pp. 156-58.

[8] Is. 11:1f.

[9] Paed., I, vii, 61, 1.

Or again the words, "I lie down and sleep, I wake again, for the Lord sustains me,"[1] were understood to have been announced oracularly (προεθέσπισεν, 'foretold') of the Savior, by the Spirit, through David: "For He not only figuratively calls [ἀλληγορεῖ] the resurrection of Christ rising from sleep; but to the descent of the Lord into the flesh he also applies the figurative term sleep."[2]

The text might have a first sense, such as the historical and yet be seen in a second sense as a type or symbol of Christ. In this sense the patriarchs might render a Christological message:

> Isaac is another type [τύπος], too (he can easily be taken in another sense [καὶ γὰρ ἔστιν ἑτέρως ἐκλαβεῖν]), this time of the Lord. He was a son, just as is the Son (he is the son of Abraham; Christ of God); he was a victim, as was the Lord, but his sacrifice was not consummated, while the Lord's was. All he did was to carry the wood of his sacrifice, just as the Lord bore the wood of the Cross. Isaac rejoiced for a mystical reason [ἐγέλα δὲ μυστικῶς] to prefigure the joy [προφητεύων χαρᾶς] with which the Lord has filled us, in saving us from destruction through His blood. Isaac did not actually suffer, not only to concede the primacy of suffering to the Word, but also to suggest [αἰνίττεται, 'speak darkly, in riddles'], by not being slain, the divinity of the Lord; Jesus rose again after His burial, as if He had not suffered, like Isaac delivered from the altar of sacrifice.[3]

The cluster of grapes cut down in the Promised Land[4] was a sign (σημεῖον), "for the cluster of grapes is the Word

---

[1] Ps. 3:5.

[2] Strom., V, xiv, 105, 3.

[3] Paed., I, v, 23, 1f.

[4] Nu. 13:24.

crushed on our account."[1] Even the events of the terrestrial life of Christ might be understood as a symbol of his celestial life. It is in this manner that the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem is interpreted:[2]

> He led the foal and its parent under the same yoke, and now having yoked together the team of mankind, He shapes the course of His chariot for the goal of immortality. He hastens to God that He may fulfill clearly [πληρῶσαι ἐναργῶν] what before He darkly hinted at [ὃ ηνίξατο]; for He drove at the first into Jerusalem, but now into heaven, a most noble spectacle for the Father, the eternal Son bringing victory![3]

The prophecy may concern itself only with the Christian religion in such matters as the Church, or sacraments. This would then render a religious prophetic sense. David's description of the queen clothed in gold standing at the right hand[4] is thus interpreted as prophetic of the Church.[5]

(4) The philosophical sense[6] may be either cosmic or psychological. As an example of the cosmic sense, Clement understands the two tablets of the Decalogue to represent heaven and earth. The Decalogue viewed as an image of heaven (κατὰ οὐράνιον εἰκόνα) "embraces sun and moon, stars, clouds, light, wind, water, air, darkness, fire." When viewed as an

---

[1] Paed., II, ii, 19, 3.

[2] Mt. 21:1-11.

[3] Protr., XII, 121, 1.

[4] Ps. 45:9, 13f.

[5] Strom., VI, xi, 91, 1; Paed., II, x, 110, 2.

[6] Mondésert, pp. 158f.

image of earth it represents "men, cattle, reptiles, wild beasts; and of the inhabitants of the water, fishes and whales; and again, of the winged tribes, those that are carnivorous, and those that use mild food; and of plants likewise, both fruit-bearing and barren." The two tablets were also prophetic of the two covenants.[1] The psychological sense is well illustrated in Clement's interpretation of Joseph being thrown into the pit:[2]

> The brothers having envied this young man, who by his knowledge was possessed of uncommon foresight, stripped him of the coat of many colours, and took and threw him into a pit (the pit was empty, it had no water), rejecting the good man's varied knowledge, springing from his love of instruction; or, in the exercise of the bare faith, which is according to the law, they threw him into the pit empty of water, selling him into Egypt which was destitute of the divine word. And the pit was destitute of knowledge; into which being thrown and stripped of his knowledge, he that had become unconsciously wise, stript of knowledge, seemed like his brethren. Otherwise interpreted, the coat of many colours is lust, which takes its way into a yawning pit.[3]

(5) The mystical sense[4] is concerned with the relations of the soul with God. In an interpretation of Lot's wife[5] Clement warns of the danger of insensibility (ἀναισθησίαν). "This woman, tradition tells us, was turned into stone on account of her love of Sodom; and by Sodomites

---

[1] Strom., VI, xvi, 133, 1-5.

[2] Gen. 37:18-24.

[3] Strom., V, viii, 53, 2-4.

[4] Mondésert, p. 159.

[5] Gen. 19:26.

we understand the atheists and those who are devoted to impiety, who are both hard of heart and without sense [ἠλίθιοι]."[1]

In turning to Clement's own statements there is some difficulty in ascertaining whether he understood a three-fold or four-fold sense of Scripture. The key passage is the following:

> The sense of the law is to be taken in three [or four] ways,--either as exhibiting a symbol, or laying down a precept for right conduct, or as uttering a prophecy [τετραχῶς δὲ ἡμῖν ἐκληπτέον καὶ τοῦ νόμου τὴν βούλησιν, * * ἢ ὡς σημεῖον ἐμφαίνουσαν ἢ ὡς ἐντολὴ κυροῦσαν εἰς πολιτείαν ὀρθὴν ἢ θεσπίζουσαν ὡς προφητείαν].[2]

Stählin notes the emendation by G. Hervet[3] of τριχῶς for τετραχῶς, but he retains τετραχῶς in the text. Mondésert and Caster[4] also retain τετραχῶς.

W. Den Boer[5] understands Clement's use of σημεῖον to indicate historical events used as a 'signal' in the older sense of 'flag-signal,' a 'sign to do something.' This would

---

[1]Protr., X, 103, 4.

[2]Strom., I, xxviii, 179, 3.

[3]Hervet made the Latin translation in 1552 of the editio princeps of Clement published by Petrus Victorius in Florence, 1550.

[4]Clément d'Alexandrie, Les Stromates I (Introduction de Claude Mondésert, Traduction et notes de Marcel Caster) (Sources Chrétiennes. Collection dirigée par H. Lubac, S. J., et J. Daniélou, S. J. Secrétariat de Direction: C. Mondésert, S. J.) Paris: Edition du Cerf, 1951.

[5]W. Den Boer, "Hermeneutic Problems in Early Christian Literature," Vigiliae Christianae, I (1947), 158-71.

eliminate the mystic flavor associated with σύμβολον which W. Wilson's above translation[1] would indicate. W. Den Boer's reading would then understand Clement to use the historical events as a signal, an order, and a prophetic revelation. Since Clement understood prophecy to choose the allegorical form and thus to be an allegory itself, Scripture would contain "the historical facts ordained for a life on ethical principles and theological revelation; consequently, the Scriptures have a historical, paradigmatic and allegorical meaning."[2]

E. C. Knowlton[3] understands the passage to refer to allegorical, analogical, and spiritual senses. In view of Clement's discussion in this chapter[4] Knowlton believes it is possible to find a four-fold interpretation. The opening statement of the chapter reads:

> The Mosaic philosophy is accordingly divided into four parts [τετραχῇ τέμνεται],--into the historic [εἰς τε τὸ ἱστορικὸν], and that which is specially called the legislative [νομοθετικόν], which two properly belong to an ethical treatise [τῆς ἠθικῆς πραγματείας]; and the third, that which relates to sacrifice [εἰς τὸ ἱερουργικόν], which belongs to physical science [τῆς φυσικῆς θεωρίας]; and the fourth, above all, the department of theology [τὸ θεολογικὸν εἶδος], "vision [ἡ ἐποπτεία,'highest grade of initiation at the Eleusinian mysteries'],"

---

[1] The Ante-Nicene Fathers, II, loc. cit., n. 4.

[2] W. Den Boer, pp. 159f.

[3] E. C. Knowlton, "Notes on Early Allegory," The Journal of English and Germanic Philology, XXXIX (1930), 166f.

[4] Strom., I, xxviii.

> which Plato predicates of the truly great mysteries. And this species Aristotle calls metaphysics.[1]

The Mosaic philosophy gives first the literal facts, or history. The legislative is the application of ethics to practice. The sacrificial or ceremonial is related to the physical science since it entails a knowledge of anatomy, physiology, reckoning of time through astronomical observation, etc. Finally, there is the mystical or spiritual level. Thus Knowlton asserts that "it is possible but not necessary to see here the four-fold interpretation: literal, or historical; the ethical, moral, or tropological; the allegorical (for matters which are unseen, or are connected with belief in the unseen, which is sometimes mystic); the spiritual, leading to the highest or hoping for it, the analogical (which is sometimes mystic).[2]

Wilson adds the following note: "The author asserts the triple sense of Scripture,--the mystic, the moral, and the prophetic."[3]

Caster translates the passage: "Either it presents a thing symbolically, or it imposes itself upon us as a command to lead a correct life, or it foretells as a prophet."[4]

---

[1] Strom., I, xviii, 176, 1f.

[2] Knowlton, pp. 166f. Cf. Bigg, p. 57, n. 2.

[3] Wilson, The Ante-Nicene Fathers, II, loc. cit.

[4] Caster, Les Stromates I, loc. cit., "ou bien elle présents une chose symboliquement, ou bien elle nous l'impose comme un commandement pour mener une vie correcte, ou bien elle vaticine en tant que prophetesse."

Stählin not only retains τετραχῶς but indicates a lacuna after τὴν βούλησιν which he supplies in the footnotes as ὡς τύπον τινὰ δηλοῦσαν from a psalm scholium.[1] W. Den Boer[2] argues that Greek scholars knew symbol, allegory, and paradigms, but that they did not know typology. For this reason he assigns the scholium to a later date as a product of the Alexandrian school which sought the support of Clement in the controversy with the Antiochian school.

In light of the above discussion it would seem best to retain τετραχῶς, but to not include the scholium. Clement used typology as he had received it, but he saw its use as allegorical. He has already indicated that one of the four senses is τὸ ἱστορικόν. It has been shown that Clement is well aware of the literal or historical sense. This first sense, therefore, would be understood along with the three interpretations as a four-fold meaning. The word σημεῖον is generally used in the Bible to denote an outward indication of an inner or hidden purpose. Thus any fact or historical event was capable of being interpreted by Clement in an allegorical fashion. This would include any typological interpretations. The Hellenistic world may not have had a Semitic understanding of typology, but Clement himself was a part of a Judeo-Christian heritage which had a keen sense of

---

[1]Pitra, Analecta Sacra, III, 109. Caster inserts this reading in both the text and translation between brackets.

[2]W. Den Boer, pp. 160f.

types. K. J. Woollcombe[1] has rightly pointed out that the heresies of Clement's day affected the traditional historical typology through their contempt for the historical value of Scripture. The higher allegorical sense was for the fully initiated. Clement meets these heresies on their own grounds by parrying their exegesis with allegorism of his own. This heretical view is well illustrated in a passage which Clement extracts from the works of Theodotus:

> The Saviour taught the Apostles at first figuratively and mystically [τυπικῶς καὶ μυστικῶς], later in parables and riddles [παραβολικῶς καὶ ἠνιγμένως], and thirdly clearly and openly [σαφῶς καὶ γυμνῶς] when they were alone.[2]

Clement makes use of typology, but it is often highly modified and allegorized.

The four-fold meaning of Scripture would entail: the literal meaning (historical), the sign (including typology, allegory, mighty acts of God, or any revelatory event, usually looking to the future), the precept for right conduct (moral and ethical, often relying heavily on allegory), and prophecy (again allegorical by nature). All but the literal meaning, therefore, is interpretative or, for Clement, allegorical. Since his methodology has not yet developed, it has been deemed best to consider all of Clement's metaphorical interpretations as allegorical. Clement was perfectly capable of

---

[1]G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe, Essays on Typology (Studies in Biblical Theology. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1957), pp. 70ff.

[2]Exc. ex Theo., 66, 1.

classifying various categories of knowledge,[1] but from an interpretative viewpoint the scriptural truths were either sensible or spiritual, external or inward, τὸ σῶμα τῶν γραφῶν ἢ αἱ διάνοιαι τῶν γραφῶν.[2]

The writings of Clement cannot be understood unless they are viewed in the light of controversy. Clement offers his gnosis, as the true and orthodox gnosis, against the gnosis of his opposition. Since the opposition had set the field of conflict beyond the literal facts of Scripture, and since Clement's own theology is not immediately apparent or fully explicit in Scripture, Clement resorts to the hidden meaning of the Word and to tradition.[3] These are the two sources of his gnosis.

The hidden truth concealed in the word is the key to the Scripture. Only the gnostic may penetrate to what the Spirit seeks to communicate: "the gnostic alone is able to understand and explain the things spoken by the Spirit obscurely [μόνον δύνασθαι τὸν γνωστικὸν τὰ ἐπικεκρυμμένως πρὸς τοῦ πνεύματος εἰρημένα νοήσειν τε καὶ διασαφήσειν]."[4] This thought is more fully seen in the following passage:

> For he who is still blind and dumb, not having understanding, or the undazzled and keen vision of the

---

[1]As, for example, the four categories of Mosaic philosophy, Strom., I, xxviii, 176, 1.

[2]Strom., VI, xvi, 132, 3.

[3]For Clement's use of tradition, see Chapter III, section 1.

[4]Strom., VI, xv, 115, 5.

> contemplative soul, which the Saviour confers, like the uninitiated at the mysteries, or the unmusical at dances, not being yet pure and worthy of the pure truth, but still discordant and disordered and material, must stand outside the divine choir. "For we compare spiritual things with spiritual." [I Cor. 2:13] Wherefore, in accordance with the method of concealment [τῆς ἐπικρύψεως τὸν τρόπον], the truly sacred Word, truly divine and most necessary for us, deposited in the shrine of truth [ἐν τῷ ἀδύτῳ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀποκείμενον], was by the Egyptians indicated [ἠνίξοντο, 'spoken darkly,' 'in riddles'] by what were called by them adyta [διὰ τῶν ἀδύτων], and by the Hebrews by the veil [διὰ τοῦ παραπετάσματος]. Only the consecrated--that is, those devoted to God, circumcised in the desire of the passions for the sake of love to that which is alone divine--were allowed access to them. For Plato also thought it not lawful for "the impure to touch the pure."
>
> Thence the prophecies [αἱ προφητεῖαι] and oracles [οἱ χρησμοί] are spoken in enigmas [δι' αἰνιγμάτων], and the mysteries [αἱ τελεταί, 'mystic rites practised at initiation,' then 'theological doctrines'] are not exhibited incontinently [ἀνέδην οὐ δείκνυνται] to all and sundry, but only after certain purifications and previous instructions.[1]

There is a secret, hidden under the veil of allegory, which can be communicated only to those who have received "certain purifications and previous instructions."

There is nothing new in Clement's association of the gnosis with the allegorical interpretation. Barnabas quotes from Exodus 33:1-3 and then proceeds to an allegorical interpretation with the transitional sentence: "But learn what knowledge says [τί δὲ λέγει ἡ γνῶσις; 'but what does the gnosis say?]."[2] Or when Abraham was instructed to circumcise the three hundred and eighteen men of his household,[3]

---

[1] Strom., V, iv, 19, 2 - 20, 1.

[2] The Epistle of Barnabas, VI, 9.

[3] Gen. 17:23, 27; 14:14.

Barnabas asks: "What then was the knowledge that was given to him [τίς οὖν ἡ δοθεῖσα αὐτῷ γνῶσις;]?[1] He concludes his fanciful interpretation with the remark: "No one has heard a more excellent lesson from me, but I know that you are worthy [ἀλλὰ οἶδα ὅτι ἄξιοί ἐστε ὑμεῖς]."[2] Clement comments on a similar association in The Shepherd of Hermas:[3]

> Did not the Power also, that appeared to Hermas in the Vision, in the form of the Church, give for transcription the book which she wished to be made known to the elect? And this, he says, he transcribed to the letter, without finding how to complete the syllables. And this signified [ἐδήλου] that the Scripture is clear to all [πρόδηλον εἶναι πᾶσι], when taken according to the bare reading [κατὰ τὴν ψιλὴν ἀνάγνωσιν]; and that this is the faith which occupies the place of the rudiments [στοιχείων τάξιν (notice the play on στοιχεῖον as first the letters of the alphabet, then the elemental or fundamental principle, and finally the elements of proof which Clement here, as often, equates with πίστις)[4]]. Wherefore also the figurative expression is employed [ἀλληγορεῖται], "reading according to the letter [πρὸς τὸ γράμμα];" while we understand [ἐκδεξόμεθα] that the gnostic unfolding of the Scriptures [τὴν διάπτυξιν ('spreading out fanwise,' and thus 'explication') δὲ τὴν γνωστικὴν τῶν γραφῶν], when faith has already reached an advanced state [προκοπτούσης ἤδη τῆς πίστεως], is likened [εἰκάζεσθαι] to reading according to the syllables.[5]

The passage from The Shepherd of Hermas continues: "The knowledge of the writing was revealed to me [ἀπεκαλύφθη

---

[1]The Epistle of Barnabas, IX, 9.

[2]The Epistle of Barnabas, IX, 9.

[3]The Shepherd of Hermas, Vision II, i, 3 - ii, 1.

[4]Strom., VI, viii, 70, 3; II, v, 24, 2; VII, xvi, 95, 3ff.; VII, xvi, 96, 1; II, ii, 9, 6.

[5]Strom., VI, xv, 131, 2f.

μοι ἡ γνῶσις τῆς γραφῆς].[1]

Clement makes clear his intended use and purpose of allegory in the opening statement of Stromata, II:

> Whatever the explication necessary on the point in hand shall demand, shall be embraced, and especially what is occult [τὸ ἐπικεκρυμμένον] in the barbarian philosophy, the department of symbol and enigma [τὸ συμβολικὸν τοῦτο καὶ αἰνιγματῶδες εἶδος, 'this symbolic and enigmatic form']; which those who have subjected the teaching of the ancients to systematic philosophic study have affected, as being in the highest degree serviceable, nay, absolutely necessary to the knowledge of truth [τῇ γνώσει τῆς ἀληθείας].[2]

Clement defends the use of the form of symbolic interpretation (τὸ τῆς συμβολικῆς ἑρμηνείας εἶδος) for many purposes and lists five areas in which it is helpful: right theology (πρὸς τὴν ὀρθὴν θεολογιαν), piety (πρὸς εὐσέβιαν), the display of intelligence (πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν συνέσεως), the practice of brevity (πρὸς βραχυλογίας ἄσκησιν), and the exhibition of wisdom (σοφίας ἔνδειξιν).[3] Such statements justifying the form of symbolic interpretation are numerous. One of the best examples is found in Stromata, V, ix:

> For life would fail me to adduce the multitude of those who philosophize in a symbolical manner [τῶν συμβολικῶς φιλοσοφούντων]. For the sake, then, of memory and brevity, and of attracting to the truth, such are the Scriptures of the Barbarian philosophy. . . . Besides, all things that shine through a veil [παρακαλύμματος] show the truth grander and more imposing; as fruits shining through water, and figures through veils, which give added reflections to them. For in addition to the fact that things

---

[1] The Shepherd of Hermas, Vision II, ii, 1.

[2] Strom., II, i, 1, 2.

[3] Strom., V, viii, 46, 1.

> unconcealed are perceived in one way, the rays of light shining round reveal defects. Since, then, we may draw several meanings [συνεκδοκὰς], as we do from what is expressed in veiled form [ἐκ τῶν μετ' ἐπικρύψεως εἰρημένων], such being the case, ignorant and unlearned man fails. But the Gnostior apprehends [καταλαμβάνει δὲ ὁ γνωστικός]. Now, then, it is not wished that all things should be exposed indiscriminately to all and sundry, or the benefits of wisdom be communicated to those who have not even in a dream been purified in soul (for it is not allowed to hand to every chance comer what has been procured with such laborious efforts); nor are the mysteries of the word [τὰ τοῦ λόγου μυστήρια] to be expounded [διηγεῖσθαι]. [Clement cites here several examples in Greek philosophy of the concealment of higher truths from the unworthy.] . . . Further, those who instituted the mysteries, being philosophers, buried their doctrines in myths, so as not to be obvious to all. Did they then, by veiling human opinions [ἀνθρωπίνας κατακρύψαντες δόξας], prevent the ignorant from handling them; and was it not more beneficial for the holy and blessed contemplation of realities [τὴν δὲ τῶν ὄντων ὄντως ἁγίαν καὶ μακαρίαν θεωρίαν] to be concealed [ἐπικεκρύφθαι]?[1]

Not only have the Greek philosophers found it beneficial to employ the form of symbolic interpretation, but it is necessary, from the very nature of Scripture, to follow this practice. Clement furnishes us with the arguments of why "the Scriptures hide the sense."[2] First, that we may be ardent in our search and ever on the alert to discover the words of salvation. It is also important that not all understand what is written, lest they receive harm as a consequence of "taking in another sense the things declared for salvation by the Holy Spirit." It is for this reason that "the holy mysteries of the prophecies [τὰ ἅγια τῶν προφητειῶν

---

[1] Strom., V, ix, 56, 1 - 58, 5.

[2] Strom., VI, xv, 126, 1 - 132, 5.

μυστήρια] are veiled in the parables [ταῖς παραβολαῖς ἐγκαλύπτεται]," and preserved for elected men, chosen to pass from faith to gnosis (ἐκ πίστεως εἰς γνῶσιν). "For the style of the Scriptures [ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῶν γραφῶν] is parabolic." Thus, also, the Lord, not being of the world, came as one being of the world. He bore all virtue (τὴν πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν) and sought to lead man nourished in this world up to intelligible and principal realities (τὰ νοητὰ καὶ κύρια) through gnosis (διὰ τῆς γνώσεως), from world to world (ἐκ κόσμου εἰς κόσμον). Therefore he used metaphoric scripture (μετοφορικῇ τῇ γραφῇ). The whole economy which prophesied of the Lord is seen as a parable to those who do not know the truth. When the Scriptures are opened the Son in the flesh, the suffering and resurrection become "the power and wisdom of God." Finally, the parabolic style of Scripture (τὸ παραβολικὸν εἶδος τῆς γραφῆς) abounded most in the prophets "in order that the Holy Spirit might show that the philosophers among the Greeks, and the wise men among the Barbarians besides, were ignorant of the future coming of the Lord, and of the mystic teaching [τὴν μυστικὴν διδασκαλίαν] that was to be delivered by Him." Prophecy, unlike Hellenic writing, does not employ "figurative forms in the expressions for the sake of beauty of diction. But from the fact that truth appertains not to all, it is veiled in manifold ways [ἐπικρύπτεται πολυτρόπως], causing the light to arise [τὸ φῶς ἀνατέλλουσα] only on those who are initiated into knowledge [μόνοις τοῖς γνῶσιν μεμυημένοις (as into the mysteries)], who seek the truth

through love [τοῖς δι' ἀγάπην ζητοῦσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν]."

Clement used allegory not only in an effort to save the Old Testament as meaningful to the Church, but to save the God of the Old Testament. Many things are said of God in the Old Testament which appeared to be out of keeping with the true nature of God, or even to be offensive. Allegory was a method conveniently at hand "to quote or deliver the Scriptures in a manner worthy of God and the Lord [κατ' ἀξίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ κυρίου]." What is heard "in a hidden manner, and in a mystery [ἐπικεκρυμμένως δηλονότι καὶ ἐν μυστηρίῳ]" should be understood sublimely (μεγαλοφρόνως), delivered in a lofty strain (ὑψηγόρως), and explained "according to the canon of truth [κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας κανόνα]."[1] Truth is discovered "by considering what is perfectly fitting and appropriate to the Lord and the Almighty God, and by confirming each thing that is proved according to the Scriptures from similar passages of Scriptures themselves."[2]

Whereas Origen, through controversy with the Antiochians, was later forced to consider the text in detail, Clement through his controversy with the gnostic heresy was compelled to emphasize the spirit rather than the letter of Scripture. Clement demonstrates a prodigious and intimate knowledge of Scripture, but the acceptable rules of his opponents and of his audience demanded the symbolic truth

---

[1] Strom., VI, xv, 124, 3-5.

[2] Strom., VII, xvi, 16, 4.

which Clement sought. This does not mean that he disparages Scripture. It has been seen that he held the Scripture to contain all truth. It does mean that his pressing concern was not proper wording but proper interpretation.

> And if our words seem to some of the uninstructed to be different from the Lord's Scriptures, let them know that it is from the Scriptures that they draw their life and breath, and that it is their object, taking these as their starting point, to set forth, not their phraseology [οὐ τὴν λέξιν] but their meaning only [νοῦν μόνον (perhaps here, 'purpose, design')].[1]

The words of the Scripture are heard "in a hidden manner, and in a mystery [ἐπικεκρυμμένως δηλονότι καὶ ἐν μυστηρίῳ]." The task of the true gnostic is twofold: (1) to understand what is heard sublimely (μεγαλοφρόνως), and (2) to explain the Scriptures "according to the canon of truth [κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας κανόνα]."

> For the deposit rendered to God [παραθήκη γὰρ ἀποδιδομένη θεῷ], according to the teaching of the Lord by His apostles [κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου διδασκαλίαν διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων], is the understanding and practice [ἡ σύνεσίς τε καὶ συνάσκησις] of the godly tradition [τῆς θεοσεβοῦς παραδόσεως]."[2]

It is to this second concern, that of the "deposit" or "godly tradition," that this study now turns.

---

[1] Strom., VII, i, 1, 5.

[2] Strom., VI, xv, 124, 4f.

CHAPTER III

PRINCIPLES OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION: TRADITION, UNITY, AND SELECTIVITY

Tradition

The Christian religion was early based upon the ultimate revelation of God given in the person and teaching of Jesus Christ as understood and proclaimed by his apostles. This deposit of "the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints"[1] was not committed to a book, but rather to the Church. The Church was to contend earnestly for the faith and to hand it on in successive generations of believers. Such was the belief of the Church in Clement's day. The object of her faith was the mighty, saving acts of God in Christ Jesus. Her tradition was the handing down of an account of these mighty acts by the witnesses. Thus, the New Testament was not a proper object of faith. It was that written part of tradition which recorded the acts which were the object of faith, and the New Testament was confirmed by those who were well versed in the early tradition to be an accurate and

---

[1]Jude 3.

authentic account of the mighty acts.[1]

It is important to observe that the New Testament did not have one official publication date, nor was it suddenly read by an untutored, pagan society. Instead, the Church accepted the books of the New Testament because they corroborated exactly what she already believed and what she already taught. The importance of the New Testament in tradition is that it was a written record of tradition by witnesses accepted as authentic and that it was certified (or canonized) by the early Church as true and correct tradition.

The Church, in the persons of her authorized teachers, understood herself as continuing to hand on the same tradition, though constantly appealing to the scriptures of both the Old and New Testaments to corroborate her truth.

The Gnostics, the first real threat to unity, appealed to at least some of the same sacred writings as those which the Church accepted. It was soon apparent that the real issue entailed a correct interpretation. Thus the Church (as well as the Gnostics) laid a great emphasis upon the correct teaching which was dependent upon the correct tradition.

The first argument for a valid tradition was the assertion that it had been handed down by a succession of bishops in each of the Apostolic Churches. An early concern is explicit in the letters of Ignatius which contain such

---

[1]H. Edward Symonds, "The Patristic Doctrine of the Relation of Scripture and Tradition," Tradition and Scripture, The Eastern Churches Quarterly, VII, Supplementary Issue (1947), 59.

statements as the following: "subject to the bishop and to the presbytery";[1] "live in harmony with the will of the bishop";[2] "be careful not to oppose the bishop, that we may be subject to God";[3] "obey the bishop and the presbytery";[4] "he is subject to the bishop as to the grace of God, and to the presbytery as to the law of Jesus Christ";[5] "with the bishop presiding in the place of God and the presbyters in the place of the Council of the Apostles."[6] Irenaeus clearly makes this claim:

> It is within the power of all, therefore, in every Church, who may wish to see the truth, to contemplate clearly the tradition of the apostles manifested throughout the whole world; and we are in a position to reckon up those who were by the apostles instituted bishops in the Churches, and [to demonstrate] the succession of these men to our own times; those who neither taught nor know of anything like what these [heretics] rave about. For if the apostles had known hidden mysteries, which they were in the habit of imparting to "the perfect" apart and privily from the rest, they would have delivered them especially to those to whom they were also committing the Churches themselves.[7]

---

[1]Ignatius, To the Ephesians, II, 2.

[2]Ignatius, To the Ephesians, IV, 1.

[3]Ignatius, To the Ephesians, V, 3.

[4]Ignatius, To the Ephesians, XX, 1.

[5]Ignatius, To the Magnesians, II, 1.

[6]Ignatius, To the Magnesians, VI, 1. See also: Ignatius, To the Magnesians, VI, 2; VII, 1; XIII, 1f; To the Trallians, Preface; ii, 1-3; III, 1; VII, 1f.; XII, 2; XIII, 2; To the Philadelphians, III, 2; IV, 1; VII, 1f.; VIII, 1; To the Smyrnaeans, VIII, 1f.; XI, 1; To Polycarp, VI, 1.

[7]Irenaeus, Against Heresies, III, iii, 1. (ANF)

Tertullian, likewise, insists on the necessity of valid succession for valid tradition:

> But if there be any (heresies) which are bold enough to plant themselves in the midst of the apostolic age, that they may thereby seem to have been handed down by the apostles, because they existed in the time of the apostles, we can say this: Let them produce the original records of their churches; let them unfold the roll of their bishops, running down in due succession from the beginning in such a manner that [the first bishop of theirs] the bishop shall be able to show for his ordainer and predecessor some one of the apostles or of apostolic men,--a man, moreover, who continued stedfast with the apostles.[1]

It is not surprising that the Gnostics countered with similar claims. Clement reports that Basilides held that he received his teaching from Glaucis who received it from Peter, and that Valentinus traced his tradition through Theodas to Paul.[2]

The second argument of Tertullian for a valid tradition was the agreement among the apostolic churches.

> Now, what that was which they preached--in other words, what it was which Christ revealed to them--can, as I must here likewise prescribe, properly be proved in no other way than by those very churches which the apostles founded in person, by declaring the gospel to them directly themselves, both viva voce, as the phrase is, and subsequently by their epistles. If, then, these things are so, it is in the same degree manifest that all doctrine which agrees with the apostolic churches--those moulds and original sources of the faith must be reckoned for truth, as undoubtedly containing that which the (said) churches received from the apostles, the apostles from Christ, Christ from God. Whereas all doctrine must be prejudged as false which savours of contrariety to the truth of

---

[1] Tertullian, On Prescription Against Heretics, XXXII.

[2] Strom., VII, xvii, 106, 3.

> the churches and apostles of Christ and God. It remains, then, that we demonstrate whether this doctrine of ours, of which we have now given the rule, has its origin in the tradition of the apostles, and whether all other doctrines do not ipso facto proceed from falsehood. We hold communion with the apostolic churches because our doctrine is in no respect different from theirs. This is our witness of truth.[1]

A third argument from both Irenaeus and Tertullian was based on the promised assistance of the Holy Spirit:

> Wherefore it is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the Church,--those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the apostles; those who, together with the succession of the episcopate, have received the certain gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father.[2]

> Grant, then, that all have erred; that the apostle was mistaken in giving his testimony; that the Holy Ghost had no such respect to any one (church) as to lead it into truth, although sent with this view by Christ, and for this asked the Father that He might be the teacher of truth . . .[3]

This one tradition may be stated in the simple facts of the creeds or it may encompass great elaboration; yet no one adds to or diminishes it. While the subject-matter of faith should not be changed, properly endowed men "may bring out the meaning of those things which are spoken in parables and accommodate them to the general scheme of faith."[4]

Irenaeus denounces the heretics for their indiscriminate use of Scripture. They act like those who bring

---

[1]Tertullian, On Prescription Against Heretics, XXI.

[2]Irenaeus, Against Heresies, IV, xxvi, 2.

[3]Tertullian, On Prescription Against Heretics, XXVIII.

[4]Irenaeus, Against Heresies, I, x, 1-3.

forward their own hypothesis and then seek the support of Homer by selecting verses at random so as to present an entirely different narrative, or like those who take the gems from a mosaic of a king and rearrange the stones into the image of a fox. No one who knows Homer or the image of the king would fail to recognize the absence of the original ὑπόθεσις.[1] Clement and Origen use the terms μυστήριον and γνῶσις for this same essential unity of Scripture. This 'mystery' or 'knowledge' is the impact of Christ as God and man on the divine world and the created world and constitutes a key to the allegorical understanding of all Scripture and of all human history. All things through the medium of Christ converge and grow towards unity. God is reconciling all things with himself and between themselves. This is essentially the equivalent of Irenaeus' ἀνακεφαλαίωσις. There is, therefore, no inconsistency in saying that the whole of faith is included in the Scripture, and that the Scripture is of no avail without the tradition.[2]

> More pointedly still, they will say that Tradition is able to supplement Scripture on very important questions, without undermining--at least in their own minds--their calm fundamental certitude that we have in the Scriptures a "pleroma" never to be superseded or even superadded to.[3]

---

[1] Irenaeus, Against Heresies, I, ix, 4.

[2] Tertullian insists that those without the true tradition should be denied the use of Scripture. On Prescription Against Heretics, XXXVII.

[3] Louis Bouyer, "Holy Scripture and Tradition as Seen by the Fathers," Tradition and Scripture, The Eastern Churches Quarterly, VII, Supplementary Issue (1947), 4.

Tradition (παράδοσις) is used of both Scripture and the traditional teaching of the Church. Scripture in the form of a collection of writings is not primarily an authority. Scripture was the whole world under God. This is seen in Clement's use of the Greek poets and philosophers and in his belief that the Word instructed Christians in all areas of living,[1] such as: eating, drinking, use of expensive vessels, laughter, speaking, social habits, use of ointments, sleep, sexual relations, clothes, jewelry, embellishing the body or face, behavior in baths, arrangement of the hair, and even walking.[2]

It has already been stated that the task of the true Gnostic is twofold: (1) to understand what is heard sublimely, and (2) to explain the scriptures "according to the canon of truth."[3] This second task is reserved to "those who receive and observe, according to the ecclesiastical rule [κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα], the exposition of Scriptures [<τὴν> τῶν γραφῶν ἐξήγησιν] explained [σαφηνισθεῖσαν] by Him." The ecclesiastical rule is "the concord [ἡ συνῳδία] and harmony [ἡ συμφωνία] of the law and the prophets in the covenant delivered at the coming of the Lord [τῇ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίαν παραδιδομένῃ διαθήκῃ]."[4] This canon applied to such various subjects as the proper celebration of

---

[1] Paed., I, 1, 3.

[2] Paed., II, III.

[3] Strom., VI, xv, 124, 6.

[4] Strom., VI, xv, 125, 2f.

the eucharist,[1] the control of the flesh,[2] and the way of the Gnostic.[3] Only the Gnostic proficient in gnosis is able to judge by rule the truth (κανοβζειν δύναται τὴν ἀλήθειαν).[4] It hardly need be said that such use of the term does not apply to a particular collection of books. Clement's canon is the rule of Christian truth, and thus constitutes an inner principle of interpretation. Through this principle Clement can advance to the higher plain of the gnosis. "Knowledge [τὴν γνῶσιν], which is perfection of faith [τελείωσιν οὖσαν τῆς πίστεως], goes beyond catechetical instruction, in accordance with the magnitude of the Lord's teaching [κατὰ τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῆς τοῦ κυρίου διδασκαλίας] and the rule of the Church [καὶ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα].[5]

Clement makes clear that this rule was not to be learned through independent study but through the authority of the past:

> The dogmas taught by the remarkable sects will be adduced; and to these will be opposed all that ought to be premised in accordance with the profoundest contemplation of the knowledge [κατὰ τὴν ἐποπτικὴν θεωρίαν γνώσεως], which, as we proceed to the renowned and venerable canon of tradition [κατὰ τὸν εὐκλεῆ καὶ σεμνὸν τῆς παραδόσεως κανόνα],[6] from

---

[1] Strom., I, xix, 96, 1.

[2] Strom., III, xi, 71, 1.

[3] Strom., IV, xv, 101, 1; VI, xv, 131, 1.

[4] Strom., VI, xvii, 150, 3.

[5] Strom., VI, xvii, 165, 1. Note Clement's definition of gnosis.

[6] I Clement to the Corinthians, VII, 2.

> the creation of the world, will advance to our view; setting before us what according to natural contemplation necessarily has to be treated beforehand, and clearing off what stands in the way of this arrangement. So that we may have our ears ready for the reception of the tradition of true knowledge [πρὸς τὴν παραδοχὴν τῆς γνωστικῆς παραδόσεως, 'for the reception of the gnostic tradition].[1]

There is a definite connection between the use of κανών and παράδοσις.

Clement held the veneration of the past in common with his contemporaries. This does not contradict his belief that the final object of faith was Christ. Since the earthly life and teaching of the Lord made manifest the truths established before the foundation of the world: "the mysteries which were hid [τὰ μυστήρια τὰ ἀποκεκρυμμένα] till the time of the apostles, and were delivered by them [καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῶν παραδοθέντα] as they received from the Lord [ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου παρειλήφασιν], and, concealed [ἀποκεκρυμμένα] in the Old Testament, were manifested [ἐφανερώθη] to the saints."[2]

This tradition, handed down from the Lord through the apostles, comprised, in its simple statement, such commonly known facts as the particular four Gospels handed down (τοῖς παραδιδομένοις).[3] However, Clement usually thought of tradition as containing an element of secrecy. Influenced by the

---

[1] Strom., I, i, 15, 2.

[2] Strom., V, x, 61, 1.

[3] Strom., III, xiii, 93, 1.

current mystery religions,[1] he more often regarded tradition as an esoteric knowledge imparted only to chosen and qualified recipients. "Christ Himself is Wisdom." Therefore the gnosis which is "imparted and revealed by the Son of God, is wisdom. . . . And the gnosis is that which has descended by transmission [[ἡ] κατὰ διαδοξὰς. . . παραδοθεῖσα] to a few [εἰς ὀλίγους] having been imparted unwritten by the apostles [ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀγράφως . . . κατελήλυθεν].[2] This is especially true of the tradition which was concerned with the interpretation of Scripture. Clement's demonstration (ἀπόδειξις) is supplied out of "the divine Scriptures [ἐκ θείων γραφῶν], the sacred writings [τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων], and out of the 'God-taught wisdom [καὶ τῆς ⟩θεοδιδάκτου⟨ σοφίας],' according to the apostles [κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον]."[3] This highest demonstration "produces intelligent faith [ἐπιστημονικὴν πίστιν] by adducing and opening up the Scriptures [διὰ τῆς τῶν γραφῶν παραθέσεώς τε καὶ διοίξεως] to the souls of those who desire to learn; the result of which is knowledge [γνῶσις]."[4] Clement's tradition seems to depend upon some "God-taught wisdom" in the sense of an illuminated intelligence: "Now the Scripture kindles the living spark of the soul, and

---

[1]See the discussion in Hugh Rahner, Griechische Mythen in Christlicher Deutung (Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1957), pp. 21-72.

[2]Strom., VI, vii, 61, 1-3.

[3]Strom., II, xi, 48, 3.

[4]Strom., II, xi, 49, 3.

directs the eye suitable for contemplation."[1] However, this does not mean unbridled flights of fancy. Scripture and tradition are closely related and dependent upon one another.

> We find, then, that the gnostic alone, having grown old in the study of the actual Scriptures, guards the orthodox doctrine of the apostles and the Church and lives a life of perfect rectitude in accordance with the gospel, being aided by the Lord to discover the proofs he is in search of both from the law and the prophets. For the life of the gnostic, as it seems to me, is nothing else than deed and words agreeable to the tradition of the Lord.[2]

What has been said of Clement's tradition thus far might have been said of the traditions claimed by the heresies, except for the insistence of Clement's tradition that Christ furnished the solution to the enigma of all Scripture and the resulting corollary that all Scripture speaks of Christ. The ecclesiastical rule is "the concord and harmony of the law and the prophets in the covenant delivered at the coming of the Lord."[3] As Zacharias was dumb until the birth of John,[4] so "the light of truth, should break the mystic silence [τὴν μυστικὴν ἀπολύσηται σιωπήν] of the dark prophetic sayings [τῶν προφητικῶν αἰνιγμάτων], by becoming good tidings [εὐαγγέλιον γενόμενος]."[5] Tradition furnishes not only the solution to interpreting Scripture but also

---

[1] Strom., I, i, 10, 4.

[2] Strom., VII, xvi, 104, 1f.

[3] Strom., VI, xv, 125, 2f.

[4] Luke 1:20, 64.

[5] Protr., I, 10, 1.

the barrier against excessive, unorthodox speculations.[1] Thus allegory is inseparable from tradition.

Attention has already been drawn to the fact that Clement, in speaking of 'mystery,' often uses the language and imagery of the Hellenistic mysteries. This should not be understood to indicate that he believes the pagan mysteries influenced the form or content of the Christian mysteries. For the sake of his audience he employed the thought forms which were already familiar: "I will show thee the Word, and the Word's mysteries, describing them according to thine own semblance of them [κατὰ τὴν σὴν διηγούμενος εἰκόνα, 'describing according to thine image']."[2] Clement's mystery is a part of the tradition which he received.

In the Exhortation to the Greeks Clement offers the mysteries of the Word to all men with the only reservation that they be "governed by reason."[3]

---

[1] Bigg, pp. 56-58; Camelot, pp. 83-84.

[2] Protr., XII, 119, 1.

[3] Ὅσοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων λογικοί ('as many of men as are spiritual'). Cf. Rom. 12:1, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν, Moffat rightly, "a spiritual rite" (wrongly in Twentieth Century New Testament, "your rational worship," and Phillips, "intelligent worship); I Pet. 2:2, τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα, "the pure spiritual milk." In Hermetica, edited and translated by Walter Scott (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), I, Scott translates wrongly, Corpus Hermeticum, I, 31, "Accept pure offerings of speech [λογικὰς θυσίας ἁγνὰς (better, 'pure spiritual offerings')] from a soul and heart uplifted to thee"; Corpus Hermeticum, XIII, 22, "To thee, O God, do I bring offerings of speech [λογικὰς θυσίας (better, 'spiritual offerings')]."

> "'Give ear, ye myriad peoples,' or rather, so many of mankind as are governed by reason [ὅσοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων λογικοί], both barbarians and Greeks; the whole race of men I call . . . And I freely give you [χαρίζομαι ὑμῖν] divine reason [λόγον], the knowledge of God [τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ θεοῦ]; I give you myself in perfection . . ."[1]

However, Clement later seems to reverse himself and to understand that the mysteries are reserved for the chosen few. He quotes from Paul:

> The mystery [τὸ μυστήριον] hidden for ages and generations but now made manifest to his saints. To them God chose to make known how great among the Gentiles are the riches of the glory of this mystery [τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου] . . .[2]

He then comments upon this passage:

> So that, on the one hand, then, are the mysteries [τὰ μυστήρια] which were hid [τὰ ἀποκεκρυμμένα] till the time of the apostles, and were delivered [παραδοθέντα] by them as they received from the Lord [ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου παρειλήφασιν], and, concealed [ἀποκεκρυμμένα], in the Old Testament, were manifested to the saints [ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις]. And on the other hand, there is "the riches of the glory of the mystery [τοῦ μυστηρίου] in the Gentiles," which is faith in hope in Christ; which in another place he has called the "foundation [θεμέλιον][3]."[4]

Clement first changes Paul's τὸ μυστήριον to τὰ μυστήρια, the secrets "manifested to the saints" but not to all men. These mysteries were delivered by the Lord through the apostles as tradition, and, since they were not for all, as secret tradition. The mystery (τὸ μυστήριον) is revealed to all, even the Gentiles, and is equated with θεμέλιον, the Christ. The

---

[1] Protr., XII, 120, 3.

[2] Col. 1:26f.

[3] I Cor. 3:11.

[4] Strom., V, x, 60, 3 - 61, 1.

secret tradition is unwritten: "For there were certainly, among the Hebrews, some things delivered unwritten [ἦν γάρ τινα ἀγράφως παραδιδόμενα]."[1] These mysteries were revealed by the Lord and were not known prior to his coming: "For the explanation of the prophetic mysteries [ἡ τῶν προφητικῶν δήλωσις μυστηρίων] had not yet been revealed [οὐδέπω γὰρ ἀποκεκάλυπτο] previous to the advent of the Lord [πρὸ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίας]."[2] Clement saw his role as twofold. On the one hand he was a Christian teacher who preached the Gospel of salvation to all. On the other hand, he was a Christian philosopher who shared with those who were prepared and worthy of the hidden treasure of truth. Paul has stated: "Him we proclaim, warning every man [πάντα ἄνθρωπον] and teaching every man [πάντα ἄνθρωπον] in all wisdom [ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ], that we may present every man [πάντα ἄνθρωπον] mature [τέλειον] in Christ."[3] Here is a clear statement of perfection in Christ through all wisdom to all men. Yet Clement chooses to read this passage to fit his own theory of esoteric knowledge:

> Not every man simply [οὐ ⟨πάντα⟩ ἁπλῶς ⟨ἄνθρωπον⟩], since no one would be unbelieving. Nor does he call every man who believes in Christ perfect [τέλειον]; but he says all the man [⟨πάντα ἄνθρωπον⟩], as if he said the whole man [ὡς εἰπεῖν ὅλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον], as if purified in body and soul. For that the knowledge

---

[1] Strom., V, x, 62, 2.

[2] Strom., V, xiv, 90, 3.

[3] Col. 1:28.

does not appertain to all [ἐπεί, ὅτι »οὐ πάντων ἡ γνῶσις«[1]] . . .[2]

The mystery is thus a secret, reserved for the few and transmitted under the veil of parables. We hear in a hidden manner (ἐπικεκρυμμένως) and in a mystery (ἐν μυστηρίῳ), and explain the Scriptures according to the canon of truth (κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας κανόνα).).

> For neither prophecy nor the Savior Himself announced the divine mysteries [τὰ θεῖα μυστήρια] simply so as to be easily apprehended by all and sundry [τοῖς ἐπιτυξοῦσιν, 'any chance persons'], but express them in parables [ἐν παραβολαῖς].[3]

> Wherefore the holy mysteries of the prophecies [τὰ ἅγια τῶν προφειτῶν μυστήρια] are veiled in parables [ταῖς παραβολαῖς ἐγκαλύπτεται]--preserved [τηρούμενα] for chosen men [τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 'for ones chosen from men'], selected to knowledge in consequence of their faith [τοῖς τε ἐκ πίστεως εἰς γνῶσιν ἐγκρίτοις, 'for ones approved from faith to knowledge']; for the style of the Scriptures is parabolic [παραβολικὸς γὰρ ὁ χαρακτὴρ ὑπάρχει τῶν γραφῶν].[4]

The μυστήριον is the Incarnation. "The Lord . . . clothing Himself with bonds of flesh (which is a divine mystery [μυστήριον θεῖον τοῦτο]), He subdued the serpent and enslaved the tyrant death."[5] God, who is love, becomes visible to us in the Incarnation. "Behold the mysteries of love [τὰ τῆς ἀγάπης μυστήρια], and then you will have a

---

[1] I Cor. 8:7: »Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνῶσις.«

[2] Strom., V, x, 61, 3.

[3] Strom., VI, xv, 124, 5f.

[4] Strom., VI, xv, 126, 2.

[5] Protr., XI, 111, 2.

vision [ἐποπτεύσεις] of the bosom of the Father."[1]

Eusebius[2] records a fragment from the seventh book of Clement's Hypotyposes: "After the Resurrection the Lord gave the tradition of knowledge [παρέδωκεν τὴν γνῶσιν] to James the Just and John and Peter, these gave it to the other Apostles and the other Apostles to the seventy, of whom Barnabas also was one."[3] This gnosis "has descended by transmission to a few, having been imparted unwritten by the apostles."[4] Clement establishes himself in this true succession, not through the bishops, but through his teachers. He lists his teachers who preserved the tradition "of the blessed doctrine derived directly from the holy apostles, Peter, James, John, and Paul, the sons receiving it from the father (but few were like the fathers)," and "came by God's will to us also to deposit those ancestral and apostolic seeds."[5] In speaking of this "blessed doctrine" Clement limits the recipients as follows:

> Thus the Lord . . . allowed us to communicate of those divine mysteries, and of that holy light, to those who are able to receive them. He did not certainly disclose to the many what did not belong to the many; but to the few to whom He knew that they belonged, who were capable of receiving and

---

[1] QDS, 37, 1.

[2] Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, II, i, 4.

[3] Cf. also (and with Paul mentioned): Strom., I, 1, 11, 3; VI, viii, 68, 2.

[4] Strom., VI, vii, 61, 3.

[5] Strom., I, i, 11, 3.

> being moulded according to them. But secret things [ἀπόρρητα] are entrusted to speech, not to writing, as is the case with God.[1]

The mysteries are delivered mystically (μυστικῶν παραδίδοται).[2]

Thus the Savior has taught the apostles "the unwritten rendering of the written [ἡ τῆς ἐγγράφου ἄγροφος]" which "has been handed down to us also."[3] The unwritten tradition is not a contradiction to the written, since they were both delivered through the same apostles. There is, nevertheless, in scripture, hidden under the veil of allegory, secret things (ἀπόρρητα) which, though in agreement with the writings, go beyond the simple rudiments of faith. It is in this realm of traditional interpretation that the battle ground of Clement and his adversaries is found. The argument is not so much what the text says as what it means. The true meaning depended upon true teaching, and true teaching sought its authority in true tradition. The concern is the identification of <u>the</u> Tradition among the traditions. For both Clement and his immediate adversaries the writings which in general constitute the present New Testament were accepted as a <u>part</u> of the Tradition. Since these writings are not grounds of serious debate, their exact text is not a question of deep concern. The question was: which tradition?

What is understood in our day as interpretation of

---

[1] <u>Strom</u>., I, i, 13, 1f.

[2] <u>Strom</u>., I, i, 13, 4.

[3] <u>Strom</u>., VI, xv, 131, 5.

the writings was seen in Clement's time as a presentation of true teachings received from the apostles and authenticated by their writings. The text of these writings might suffer in quotation as a result of being used to authenticate or illustrate the teaching. This would be a more natural and even more insidious form of doctrinal influence upon the text (in quotation) than the theory that a doctrinal bias was first held, then the text was deliberately changed and an interpretation was drawn from the more agreeable reading. The latter would have been patently fraudulent and would have been so declared by both friends and enemies. It would have defeated the purpose for which the writings were actually used. It would be quite another thing if in presenting the correct teaching a reference was made to a written portion of this teaching in a paraphrastic fashion. Since the higher meaning lay in the teaching and since this meaning was concealed allegorically in the text, a slight rewording or paraphrase would be no more than a teacher's effort to bring out the true meaning and intent of the original writer.

Such an understanding of tradition and scripture would reflect not so much the state of Clement's text as the presuppositions of his doctrine. While peculiar readings in Clement may have affected later texts, they may indicate more of what Clement delivered than of what he received.

Clement's authority was the true tradition which he had received from the Lord through the apostles and their true successors. Scripture constituted the written part of

this tradition. Since the higher truth was not for all men, the written part of tradition was commonly preserved in parabolic form. This was true of both the Old and New Testament. Correct interpretation consisted in the presentation of the true teachings concealed within the scripture. The most frequently used principle for associating the higher meaning of secret tradition with the parabolic meaning of written tradition was allegory. For the initiated to substitute the higher meaning into the text was not to alter the text. This practice simply made clear what the text in its hidden meaning had already said.

Unity of Scripture

It has already been demonstrated that a technical "canon," especially with regard to the New Testament, was only in the process of formation in Alexandria. It has also been demonstrated that an effort had been made to bring both covenants into a harmony of authority and that this was at least beginning to mean the agreement of two bodies of literature. It is now necessary to investigate Clement's doctrine of the unity of Scripture.

Clement could speak of "Scripture" as one whole and as even by one author. Thus he deems as necessary "the reading of the Scriptures of the Lord [ἥ τε τῶν γραφῶν τῶν

κυριακῶν ἀνάγνωσις]."[1] He can speak of τῶν ἡμετέρων γραφῶν in contrast to worldly λόγοι.[2] He speaks of ἡ πᾶσα γραφή witnessing to the concealment of God,[3] although his examples are drawn only from those passages which describe the Tabernacle. Again he claims ἡ γραφὴ πᾶσα ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς testifies that God hears the prayers of the just;[4] but the only example is a petition of Samuel. The term »γραφή« is not entirely clear as to scope and delineation, but a sense of unity is apparent. A most striking illustration is given of the Lord playing upon the saved as upon a lyre, bringing to life "the ecclesiastical symphony at once of the law and the prophets, and the apostles along with the Gospel [συμφωνίαν τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν νόμου καὶ προφητῶν ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀποστόλων σὺν καὶ εὐαγγελίῳ], and the harmony [συνῳδίαν] which obtained in each prophet, in the transitions of the persons."[5] The four elements of Law, Prophets, Apostles, and Gospels stand in a harmony wrought by the hand of one master musician and constitute an "ecclesiastical symphony" in which the Church now joins.

This basic concept of Clement is not original with him. While the Epistle of Diognetus has no generally

---

[1] Strom., VI, xi, 91, 5.

[2] Strom., IV, vii, 44. 1.

[3] Strom., V, vi, 32, 1.

[4] Strom., VI, iii, 29, 3.

[5] Strom., VI, xi, 88, 3-5.

acceptable date,[1] almost identical language is used in this writing: "Then is the fear of the law sung, and the grace of the prophets is known, and the faith of the gospels is established, and the traditions of the apostles is guarded, and buoyant is the grace of the Church."[2] Whatever the origin, the concept is basic. Clement does not deny the diversity.[3] This only enriches the harmony when under the control of the Master's touch.

Clement makes no distinction between the Law and the Prophets. Both were pre-exilic; both were destroyed in the captivity, and Esdras under inspiration restored again "the whole of the ancient Scriptures [πᾶσας παλαιὰς . . . γραφάς]."[4] In his Exhortation to the Greeks Clement devotes the eighth chapter to τὰς προφητικὰς γραφάς which are οἱ χρησμοί.[5] This chapter contains the following quotations from

---

[1]For discussions of the problem see: Johannes Quasten, Patrology (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1950), I, 248-53; Berthold Altaner, Patrology, trans. Hilda C. Graef (New York: Herder and Herder, 1960), pp. 117-19; Henry G. Meecham, The Epistle to Diognetus (Manchester: The University Press, 1949), pp. 16-19; Henri Irénée Marrou, A Diognète (Sources Chrétinnes. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1951), pp. 241-69. Marrou gives the probable date of 190-200. Edgar J. Goodspeed, A History of Early Christian Literature (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942), p. 148, "it probably belongs to the third century." G. W. H. Lampe (ed.), A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961), I, xxiv, dates chapters I-X as a second century work. However, he dates chapters XI and XII (in which this quotation is found) from a later period.

[2]Epistle to Diognetus, XI, 6.

[3]Strom., VI, xi, 88, 5. τὴν καθ' ἕκαστον προφήτην κατὰ τὰς μεταπηδήσεις τῶν προσώπων συνῳδίαν.

[4]Strom., I, xxii, 149, 3. [5]Protr., VIII, 77, 1.

the prophets: Isaiah (9 times), Jeremiah (4 times), and Amos (1 time). It also contains the following quotations from other books of the Old Testament: Genesis (1 time), Deuteronomy (3 times), I Kings (2 times), Psalms (3 times), and Proverbs (4 times). It can only be assumed that the Old Testament in general was considered "prophetic scriptures." The Savior is, among other things, a νομοθέτης since "He gave the law by the mouth of the prophets [δὶ δοὺς τὸν νόμον ἐν τῷ στόματι τῶν προφητῶν], enjoining [ἐντελλόμενος] and teaching most distinctly what things are to be done, and what not."[1] Clement can speak of Moses as the "animate law [νόμος ἔμψυχος]," [2] and yet classify him with "the other prophets."[3] Even David and Solomon were prophets.[4]

Clement saw the authors of the Old Testament as prophets. If they were not, they could not have written Scripture. Since the whole of the Old Testament, even the Law, spoke of Christ, then the whole had to be prophetic. Clement thus tends to disregard the ancient distinction between Law and Prophecy. He uses the terms, and undoubtedly understood the division, but theologically the distinction was meaningless if not detrimental.

The problem of the unity of the Old Testament and the

---

[1] Strom., II, v, 21, 5.

[2] Strom., I, xxvi, 167, 3.

[3] Strom., VI, iii, 28, 3.

[4] Strom., I, xxi, 113, 1.

New Testament was both more pressing and more complex. The Church faced two assailants upon her use of the Old Testament. The first of these were the Jews who claimed the Old Testament as their own and opposed the Church's adopting and distorting their spiritual heritage. Thus Celsus has his Jew question:

> How is it that you take the beginning of your system from our worship, and when you have made some progress you treat it with disrespect, although you have no other foundation to show for your doctrines than our law?[1]

The second opposition came from Marcion and his followers who discarded the Old Testament and denied that its God was the same as He whom Jesus Christ revealed. This is the background of Gnosticism's tendency to disregard the Law.

The task of the Church was somehow to treat the Old Testament as a Christian book and yet to insist on the supremacy of the revelation in Christ. The outcome of this difficulty was to proclaim that Christ prophesied and appeared in the Old Testament and that he produced both Old and New Testaments. To this end Irenaeus had already stated:

> But one and the same householder produced both covenants, the Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who spake with both Abraham and Moses, and who has restored us anew to liberty, and has multiplied that grace which is from Himself.[2]

Since there was but one author, the Christian was obligated to seek the Christian meaning in the Old Testament. Thus by search for a τύπος even those misdeeds which were not

---

[1] Origen, Against Celsus, II, iv.

[2] Irenaeus, Against Heresies, IV, xi, 3.

commended by the Church and which are either condemned or left uncensured by the Scriptures bear the true Word beneath their unseemly appearance.[1] The same God of righteousness who in the Old Testament took vengeance typically, temporarily, and moderately, stands in judgment with a more enduring and rigid punishment.[2]

Harnack[3] considered that the controversy with the Jews began to play a lesser role by the time of Irenaeus and Tertullian. He contended that by this time the Jews were no longer feared. Irenaeus could argue that apostles "scrupulously act according to the dispensation of the Mosaic law, showing that it was from one and the same God."[4] As a consequence the Church maintained against the heresies that the Jews had the right doctrine and that they only lacked the knowledge of the Son of God. The Church found herself to be an institution with the need of ceremonial injunctions. A biblical basis for these was available only in the Old Testament.

With the diminishing of the threat from Judaism, the attacks of the followers of Marcion and the new needs of the ecclesiastical system heightened the Church's estimate of the Old Testament at the very time of the emergence of a New

---

[1]Irenaeus, Against Heresies, IV, xxxi, 1.

[2]Irenaeus, Against Heresies, IV, xxviii, 1.

[3]Harnack, History of Dogma, II, 303.

[4]Irenaeus, Against Heresies, III, xii, 15.

Testament as an authoritative Christian book.[1]

Clement denies the distinction between an Old Testament of justice and a New Testament of love. The Law had divine authority and beneficent results. It is "able to make some righteous from unrighteous," and "for those who have chosen to live temperately and justly, it conducts to immortality."[2] The element of fear is no justification for denying the Old Testament. Fear is necessary to tame those who are not convinced by reason.[3] If fear is evil, "how can what is bad be the cause of what is best?"[4] The fear which proceeds from the law is not only just, but good, since it takes away evil.[5] Finally, the fear is not of God but of falling away from God.[6]

> And how can the law be not good, which trains, which is given as the instructor [ὁ παιδαγωγός][7] to Christ, that being corrected by fear, in the way of discipline, in order to the attainment of the perfection which is by Christ.[8]

Both the Law and the Gospel are the "energy"[9] of one Lord

---

[1]Harnack, History of Dogma, II, 304-5.

[2]Strom., I, xxvii, 173, 4.

[3]Strom., II, viii, 37, 2.

[4]Strom., II, viii, 28, 1.

[5]Strom., II, viii, 39, 4.

[6]Strom., II, viii, 40, 2.

[7]Not διδάσκαλος but 'boy-leader, custodian' as Paul describes the law in Gal. 3:24. Cf. Joseph Sevier Callaway, "Paul's Letter to the Galatians and Plato's Lysis," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVII (1948), 353-55.

[8]Strom., II, vii, 35, 2.

[9]'The infusion of the mystic supernatural force in one spirit-possessed,' cf. Kenneth W. Clark, "The Meaning

(ἐνὸς γὰρ κυρίου ἐνέργεια), and the fear of the Law is merciful unto salvation.[1]

Clement held a unity of the Gospel and the Old Testament. To the Jews he laid claim to the unbroken continuity of the Gospel and the Old Testament. Both served the Word as a means of educating mankind. "But what a means of education is the one given through the Apostles!"[2] More to the point, both Testaments represent one and the same revelation. The truth was the same in both instances. The difference lay only in degree. In a discussion of martyrs Clement recalls the listing of the saints in Hebrews.[3] In view of these "witnesses" we also are to look "to Jesus the pioneer and perfecter of our faith."[4] The righteous of both Testaments receive one salvation in Christ.[5] The same revelation implies that the Law is not set aside by a different Gospel. The task of the Law is "to deliver us from a dissolute life and all disorderly ways." The purpose of the Law is "to lead us from unrighteousness to righteousness." This is also the task and purpose of the Gospel. The Lord did not "come to abolish the law and the prophets . . . but to fulfill them."[6]

---

of ΈΝΕΡΓΈΩ and ΚΑΤΑΡΓΈΩ in the New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, LIV (1935), 93-101.

[1] Strom., I, xxvii, 174, 3.

[2] Paed., III, xii, 94, 1f.

[3] Hebrews 11f.

[4] Hebrews 12:1f.

[5] Strom., IV, xvi, 103, 2.

[6] Mt. 5:17.

"'To fulfill [πληρῶσαι]' does not imply that it was defective [ἐνδεῆ], but that by his coming the prophecies of the law [τὰς κατὰ νόμον προφητείας] are accomplished [ἐπιτελεῖς γενέσθαι] . . ." Even prior to the Law the Logos proclaimed the demand for right conduct.[1] Since love is the heart of the Gospel proclamation, it bears its own constraints. "Love permits not to sin."[2] Clement quotes Paul: "Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the Law."[3]

One should be warned that Clement is not careful in distinguishing between the Christ, the Word, and the Spirit. He shows the awareness when forced by the language of the Valentinians. He quotes them as saying: "that the Spirit [ὁ πνεῦμα] which each one of the prophets had adapted to service was poured out upon all those of the Church. Therefore too the signs of the Spirit, healings and prophecies, are fulfilled through the Church."[4] The Valentinians regarded the prophecies of the Old Testament as the product of various forces. Irenaeus clarifies this with the following statement:

> Then, again, they divide the prophecies [into different classes], maintaining that one portion was uttered by the mother [Achamoth], a second by her seed, and a third by the Demiurge. In like manner, they hold that Jesus uttered some things under the influence of the Saviour, others under the influence of the mother, and others still under that of the Demiurge . . .[5]

---

[1] Strom., III, vi, 46, 1f.

[2] Strom., IV, xviii, 112, 4.

[3] Rom. 12:10.

[4] Exc. ex Theo., 24, 2.

[5] Irenaeus, Against Heresies, I, vii, 3.

Clement answers this assertion by stating:

> But they do not know that the Paraclete [ὁ Παράκλητος], who now works continuously in the Church, is of the same substance and power [τῆς αὐτοῦ οὐσίας ἐστὶ καὶ δυνάμεως] as he who worked continuously according to the Old Testament.[1]

R. P. Casey[2] correctly notes that Clement is using παράκλητος in the usual sense as a title of the Holy Spirit and not of Jesus. Clement sees a diversity of modes and degrees of revelation. He also has no quarrel with the persons of God. He is concerned only at the point that the same one God revealed himself in every instance. "There is a variety in the manner of revelation, but its source and aim are one, and no element in the scheme is properly intelligible apart from all the rest."[3]

In Clement's use of the Old Testament and the Gospel a subtle but important difference may be discerned. The Old Testament is treated as a book. The emphasis is primarily on what is written. But in the Gospel the primary concern is in the Lord's teaching. The test of a doctrine was to be found in the authority of the Lord. This did not necessarily imply that the teaching was authoritative because it was recorded in certain books. This distinction is not carefully observed by Clement in every case. The attitude is manifested in

---

[1] Exc. ex Theo., 24, 2.

[2] The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria, p. 120.

[3] Tollinton, II, 201.

emphasis and proportion. There are many exceptions in his citations from both the Old and New Testaments. In certain instances of Old Testament usage the personality and authority of the writer is recognized. Genesis and Deuteronomy have an increased authority because they claim the illustrious name of Moses. To a lesser degree the same may be said for the writings attributed to Isaiah and Solomon. On the other hand, the term "Scripture" is frequently applied to the sayings of the Lord[1] and to the writings of Paul.[2]

In spite of the exceptions, the emphasis of authority for Old Testament citations lies in the fact that the citations were written in books which carried recognized authority. The emphasis of authority for gospel citations lies in the fact that the Lord has spoken. Clement's acceptance of the four Gospels has already been discussed. Only these four deserve particular attention because only these four have been handed down. Tradition, as a principle of interpretation for Clement, has been considered above. Clement is in accord with the Church against the heretics in maintaining the connection with the apostles through the παράδοσις ἐκκλησιαστική. Clement is persuaded that this tradition is free from errors

---

[1]E.g. Paed., III, xi, 70, 4, φησὶν ἡ γραφή in quoting Mt. 6:22; Strom., II, v, 22, 3, τῇ γραφῇ λεγούσῃ in quoting Lk. 18:25; Strom., III, iv, 27 3, γέγραπται in quoting Lk. 6:30 (Mt. 5:42); Strom., I, xvii, 81, 1, γεγράφθαι in quoting Jn. 10:8.

[2]E. g. Strom., VI, viii, 66, 1, ὅτι φησὶν ἡ γραφή in quoting II Cor. 11:14.

and is identical with the παράδοσις τοῦ κυρίου. For this reason the chief value of the Gospels is not their authority as Scripture. He does not question their contents. They accurately reported the life, death, and resurrection of the Lord. Clement's chief interest is always the διδασκαλία, not the bare πράξεις. "He was exclusively philosophically interested."[1] The narrative portions of the Gospels do not lend themselves freely to Clement's concern. When they are used they are transformed through allegory to the realm of ideas.

The result is that what Clement mainly quotes from the Gospels is the teachings and words of Jesus. The teachings are the very things which Clement has personally received from the Church and her teachers. He is a part of the living tradition. Thus even when he quotes words of Jesus from the Gospels, it is not so much the ultimate source of authority which he cites but illustrations from phrases familiar to both the writer and the audience, which clarify, or to be more exact, epitomize, the traditional teaching which Clement delivers as true because he received it from the Church which received it from the Lord and his apostles. Clement passes on the teachings which he received from teachers who ultimately had known (and not in the distant past at that) the Παιδαγωγός. That some of these teachers had recorded a part of these teachings did not thus constitute in these records the ultimate authority which could rest only in the

---

[1]Kutter, p. 106, n. 1.

Παιδαγωγός. At most they were called in witness as corroborating teachers of the one true παράδοσις ἐκκλησιαστική.

Clement stands in a transitional period. In his writings appear brief glimpses of the Gospels as writings attaining the same book authority as the Old Testament. The expression, "the Lord's Scripture and his actual voice,"[1] indicates the development in process from a position which is expressed by such phrases as "that voice of the Saviour,"[2] and "that divine voice"[3] to an incipient book approach expressed by such phrases as "in the Gospel, the Lord called,"[4] and "the Lord announced in a Gospel."[5]

In spite of this traditional problem, the Gospel was a unity with the Law and the Prophets. The three are the product of the one Lord and proclaim one united teaching. A convenient demonstration of this unity may be seen in Clement's discussion of the various possible applications of the words: "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."[6] The Lord when he

---

[1] Strom., VII, xvi, 95, 5.

[2] Strom., I, iii, 23, 2, ἡ σωτήριος ἐκείνη φωνή, followed by a citation from Mt. 3:20 (Lk. 9:58).

[3] Strom., V, xiii, 86, 4, τὴν θείαν ἐκείνην φωνήν, followed by a citation from Jn. 10:1-3, 7.

[4] Paed., II, xii, 125, 2, ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ κέκληκεν.

[5] Strom., V, x, 63, 7, ⟩παρήγγειλεν ὁ κύριος⟨ ἔν τινι εὐαγγελίῳ.

[6] Mt. 18:20.

gave the Law was with the one, the Jew. Later when he inspired the prophets and called believers from the Gentiles by the teaching of the prophets, he brought the two people together. The third is the new man, made out of the two, the one Lord in the flesh and in the Church.[1] Notice that the Lord gave the Law and inspired the prophets, but that he is the Gospel. "And the law, the prophets, and also the gospel were brought together in Christ's name into a single knowledge [εἰς μίαν γνῶσιν]."[2]

Finally, there is the question of the unity of the apostolic writings with the Law, Prophets, and Gospels. Since Clement's authority was apostolic it was inevitable that he should see the apostolic witness as in agreement with the Gospel which was a unity with the Law and Prophets. The apostles were the immediate recipients of the teaching of the Lord. Apostolic hands delivered these teachings to the Church.

Clement does not make clear who were the acceptable apostles nor has he reached any final decision concerning the extent of apostolic writings. James, Peter, John, and Paul are singled out, but certainly not to the exclusion of οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι.[3] The apostles "were perfected in all [ἐν πᾶσι πεπληρωμένοι]" so that one might find "in their acts and

---

[1] Strom., III, xi, 70, 2.

[2] Strom., III, xi, 70, 3.

[3] Strom., VI, viii, 68, 2.

writings [ἐκ τῶν πράξεων καὶ τῶν συγγραμμάτων αὐτῶν] knowledge, life, preaching, righteousness, purity, prophecy [τὴν γνῶσιν, τὸν βίον, τὸ κήρυγμα, τὴν δικαιοσύνην, τὴν ἁγνείαν, τὴν προφητείαν]."[1] From this it would be assumed that Clement held as equally valid the acts and teachings of all those whom he understood as apostles. To a certain extent he does. This is one of the reasons for his apparently indiscriminate use of non-canonical writings.

In actual practice Clement shows a strong preference for the apostle Paul. He refers to Paul on numerous occasions as ὁ ἀπόστολος,[2] ὁ μακάριος ἀπόστολος,[3] ὁ θεσπέσιος ἀπόστολος.[4] He explains away the difficulty of Paul the apostle not having been a disciple of Jesus by pointing out that Paul's writings "depend on the Old Testament, breathing and speaking of them."[5] All the writings of Paul "preserve the harmony of the law and the gospel [τὴν ἀκολουθίαν ('sequence, succession') σῴζουσαι τοῦ νόμου πρὸς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον]."[6]

The fact of his recurring defense of Paul may indicate that Clement was not only seeking to help save Paul for the

---

[1] Strom., IV, xxi, 134, 1.

[2] E.g., Protr., V, 65, 4.

[3] E.g., Protr., IX, 83, 3.

[4] E.g., Strom., I, xix, 94, 4.

[5] Strom., IV, xxii, 134, 2.

[6] Strom., III, xii, 86, 1.

Church,[1] but even that he himself saw some personal necessity of habilitating Paul in his apostolic scheme. There was a strong movement to disqualify Paul and his writings. Clement is insisting that Paul is a part of the true tradition. He proves this by pointing out his agreement with the Gospel and particularly the Law. In fact, he pointedly neglects the disagreements of Paul and the Law. Perhaps this concern of Clement increases his tendency to include such writings as Barnabas and Hermas. Clement must have also been persuaded toward Paul by what he felt to be a similarity of their two positions. As Paul had faced the difficult task of mediating the Semitic Gospel to the Greeks, so Clement saw his task as making a barbarian truth compatible with the Greek philosophical mind. He was insisting that in either case transitions could be made which led to apparent innovations but which were in reality in perfect agreement with the true faith. For Clement Paul had preserved the ἀκολουθίαν of both the Law and the Gospel, else he himself would stand condemned. The unity of the Apostles with the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel is an important principle of interpretation for it involves the unity of Clement's teachings with "Scripture." Such a view will be shown to have a direct bearing on Clement's attitude toward citations.

Adolph Harnack has rendered an opposing judgment to

---

[1]Cf. Albert E. Barnett, Paul Becomes a Literary Influence (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941), pp. 222-77.

what has just been said:

> Unless all appearances are deceptive, it was, strictly speaking, only the four Gospels that he considered and treated as completely on a level with the Old Testament. The formula: ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον (the Law and the Prophets and the Gospel) is frequently found, and everything else, even the apostolic writings is judged by this group. He does not consider even the Pauline Epistles to be a court of appeal of equal value with the Gospels, though he occasionally describes them as γραφαί.[1]

Our disagreement with Harnack lies in the emphasis which he is making upon a New Testament canon consisting of a collection of writings to be read in the Church. Our study has already indicated that such a rigid view was late in coming to Alexandria. The very fact that Clement had a rather free canon only supports the contention that Clement did not feel compelled to make sharp distinctions between the Gospel as found in gospel writings and the Gospel as found in apostolic writings. The Gospel for Clement was the παιδαγωγία. It is the Gospel of the true teachings delivered to men, by grace, through the Λόγος whom Clement describes as the Παιδαγωγός.

> Both laws served the Word as means of educating mankind [εἰς παιδαγωγίαν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος], the one through Moses, the other through the Apostles. But what a means of education is the one given through the Apostles [οἷα γοὺν καὶ δι' ἀποστόλων <ἡ> παιδαγωγία]![2]

Clement then proceeds to illustrate just what is the παιδαγωγία. He accomplishes this by simply quoting the following passages: Eph. 4:25-5:2; 5:22, 25, 28; 6:1, 4, 5, 7, 9;

---

[1]Harnack, History of Dogma, II, 58.

[2]Paed., III, xii, 94, 1f.

Gal. 5:25; 5:26-6:2; 6:7, 9; I Thess. 5:13-15, 20-22; Col. 4:2, 5, 6; I Tim. 4:6-8; 6:12; Rom. 12:8-13.[1] Through the words of these quotations ὁ παιδαγωγὸς αὐτός speaks τὴν παιδαγωγίαν. Every demonstration is Pauline; not a single quotation is from the Gospels. There is an unquestioned and affirmed principle of unity.

According to Clement there is only one revelation, and that by the Λόγος from the beginning to the present. Since Christ, the Word, is understood as mediator of all revelation, Christ in the flesh of Jesus is not peculiar with regard to other forms of revelation. The Old Testament has become a Christian book fulfilled by spiritual truth. Thus its message is not found in its immediate concern or contemporary situation (not even in some future immediate situation). "The Old Testament is far more than a prophesy, it is already the fulfillment of itself."[2] The apparent inconsistencies are due to a misunderstanding of the nature of Scripture. "Neither prophecy nor the Saviour Himself announced the divine mysteries simply so as to be easily apprehended by all and sundry, but express them in parables."[3] The divine mysteries are understood only by those "who receive and observe, according to the ecclesiastical rule [κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα], the exposition of the Scriptures [<τὴν> τῶν γραφῶν ἐξήγησιν].

---

[1] Paed., III, xii, 94, 2-96, 3.

[2] Munck, p. 201.

[3] Strom., VI, xv, 124, 6.

explained by Him [ὑπ' αὐτοῦ σαφηνισθεῖσαν]."[1] Thus, this ecclesiastical rule becomes "the concord and harmony [ἡ συνῳδία καὶ ἡ συμφωνία] of the law and the prophets in the covenant delivered at the coming of the Lord [τῇ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίαν παραδιδομένῃ διαθήκῃ]."[2] One can look only at τὸ σῶμα τῶν γραφῶν[3] and behold the bare narratives of wars and laws with all their diversities. Or one can perceive "according to the teaching of the Lord by his apostles"[4] the παιδαγωγία in all the beauty of its oneness.

The one Logos has spoken through the Law, the Prophets, the Gospels and the Apostles. They are a unity in spite of apparent inconsistencies. "Neither prophecy nor the Saviour Himself announced the divine mysteries simply so as to be easily apprehended by all and sundry, but express them in parables."[5] Clement believed that he had the true 'ecclesiastical tradition' which was identical with the 'tradition of the Lord.' The divine mysteries, revealed in the tradition, make clear through allegory the parabolic statements of scripture, and thus bring to light the unity of all the utterances of the one Logos. One utterance is made intelligible by another utterance under the guidance of the 'ecclesiastical

---

[1] Strom., VI, xv, 125, 2.

[2] Strom., VI, xv, 125, 3.

[3] Strom., VI, xv, 132, 3.

[4] Strom., Vi, xv, 124, 4.

[5] Strom., IV, xv, 124, 6.

rule.' The result in not just harmonization (in the technical) sense in which it is used today), but rather true teaching more clearly expressed. A second principle for associating the higher meaning of the secret tradition with the parabolic meaning of written tradition was the unity of scripture. With Clement the use of this principle went far beyond the mere harmonization of the events within the Gospels. The principle included all scripture. The substitution of words from one citation with those of another citation was not, for Clement, the artificial stringing together of biblical quotations. It was an effort to point out what the Logos had intended to say. The new statement becomes the more revealing statement. For Clement it is in its changed form a proper quotation of scripture.

Selectivity

The use or disuse of particular passages of scripture (or even parts of passages) is an important, but much neglected, principle of interpretation. Investigation of the subject is usually confined to the delineation of a particular writer's canon, or at best to his functional canon. The question goes beyond the mere fact that a writer quotes frequently, or tends to neglect, a particular book within or without the canon. A writer may accept the canon of his Church and still develop his own personal and functional canon. Clement's canon in the sense of a fixed collection of writings was still

uncertain.[1]

The problem of selectivity will be considered in this section as the use or disuse of passages, phrases, or words within the presently accepted New Testament canon.

It is assumed that some principle or doctrine held by a writer will influence the compatibility of certain statements in scripture; whereas other statements will tend to be less meaningful, meaningless, or even repugnant. This influence will be operative in spite of the interpreter's avowed doctrines of either the canon or authority of scripture. Those words which speak to the interpreter will both influence his thinking and be proclaimed as evidence for his understanding. Those words which are rejected (even though not consciously rejected) will be neglected unless their incongruity endangers the understanding of the interpreter. This divergence may be recognized by the interpreter himself, or it may be brought to his attention by some critic. In either case, the interpreter will be forced to either deny the authority of the statement or to explain the apparent inconsistency through some other principle.

Clement proved to be entirely capable of finding the understanding he desired from even difficult passages. Yet there is a much larger body of materials upon which Clement has in reality passed judgment through silence. It would be folly to indicate that all those passages which do not appear

---

[1]See the section on "Canon" in Chapter I.

in any of Clement's writings were incompatible with Clement; he makes no pretense of presenting an exegesis of the entire New Testament. Nevertheless, there are certain types of scripture which Clement seems to prefer and certain types which he seems to neglect. Of particular interest to this study are the incomplete quotations which Clement at times employs.

Clement condemns the manner in which heretics use scripture. They do not "quote them entire," but gather "a few expressions here and there."[1] They "collect [ἀναλέγονται] extracts from the prophets [ἐκ τινων προφητικῶν περικοπῶν], making a selection [λέξις ἀπανθισάμενοι, 'picking out (as flowers) phrases'] and mischievously stringing them together."[2]

In spite of the above criticism concerning his opponents, Clement frankly admits that proper selection is his own method of learning the truth: "We, selecting testimonies [τὰ μαρτύρια ἐκλεγόμενοι] from the divine oracles [παρὰ τῶν θείων λογίων], boast of learning the truth by the Son of God, prophesied at first, and then explained."[3] His readers are exhorted "to elaborate the dogmas by the selection of Scriptures."[4] The concern of Clement is not selectivity but the

---

[1]Strom., VII, xvi, 15, 3 - 97, 2.

[2]Strom., III, iv, 38, 1.

[3]Strom., VI, xv, 123, 1.

[4]Strom., VII, xiv, 84, 2.

principle which governs selectivity. The fault lies with "those who are wrong [οἱ παραπίπτοντες, 'erring, going astray'] in essentials [εἰς τὸ κυριώτατα]." These "do not quote or deliver the Scriptures in a manner worthy of God and of the Lord."[1] The governing principle is found in "the deposit [παραθήκη] rendered to God, according to the teaching of the Lord by His apostles," which is "the understanding and the practice of the godly tradition [τῆς θεοσεβοῦς παραδόσεως]."[2] The same principle of tradition which controls the principles of allegory and unity of the scriptures also controls the principle of selectivity.

A study has been made by J. M. Norris[3] of Clement's actual use of the New Testament in his writings. He has included all references from the use of concepts without citation, allusion, or use of the same language, to direct quotations with definite citations. He has demonstrated this material by plotting all references on a bar graph which horizontally indicates the New Testament by book, chapter, and verse, and vertically indicates the number of references to any particular verse.[4] He has also classified all references in five classes according to the degree of Clement's

---

[1] Strom., VI, xv, 124, 3.

[2] Strom., VI, xv, 124, 4.

[3] John Massilon Norris, "The Functional New Testament of Clement of Alexandria" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 1945).

[4] Ibid., pp. 64-103.

assimilation of the passages. The result of this classification is presented by book and class in a table.[1] Norris' criteria for classification are open to criticism, and his graph, while presenting a rather clear picture of those areas of the New Testament under heavy or light use, offers little help to the immediate problem of textual variants.

In his conclusion Norris seeks to explain some of the heavy and light areas of concentration. The large use of the Sermon on the Mount[2] is attributed to Clement's interest in moral conduct and ethical achievement. The Judgment Scene[3] "accords with Clement's idea of moral responsibility of man growing out of man's possession of free will." The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel[4] "corresponds to the importance which he ascribes to the Logos as Creator, source of life, and God incarnate." The thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians reflects Clement's concern for love. The twelfth verse supports "the supreme value he places in the Christian Gnostic's direct and unimpeded vision of God."[5]

The frequency of some individual verses is treated: Matthew 5:8 speaks to Clement's insight into the nature of God and the quality essential to those who see him; Matthew 5:28 helps to emphasize the need for inner discipline in moral

---

[1] Ibid., Table I, p. 104.

[2] Mt. 5-7. [3] Mt. 25:31-46.

[4] John 1:1-5.

[5] Norris, p. 126.

conduct; Matthew 5:48 supports Clement's aim at perfection.[1]

Norris also seeks to explain certain notable omissions. Since Clement saw the Christian life as orderly growth without sudden conversion from sin and violence, he makes no use of Paul's conversion in Acts nor of his own account in Galatians.[2] As a result of little interest in the human Jesus the birth stories in Matthew and Luke[3] are almost blank. Throughout the Gospels the interest is on the teachings. The crucifixion passages are treated lightly and there is no mention of the resurrection stories. Clement's lack of interest in the second coming causes him to almost avoid Revelation.[4]

The above examples (along with others) which Norris points out do not involve the actual variants of any text, but they do indicate the doctrinal influence operative in the principle of selectivity.

This study is concerned with variant readings due to doctrinal influence. With regard to the principle of selectivity this study is not concerned with the frequency of use of any portion of scripture. Neither is it concerned with those areas within the New Testament to which Clement makes no reference. To be treated as an example of selectivity a citation must obviously avoid certain words or phrases for

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 126f.

[2] Acts 9:1-9; 22:3-11; 26:12-18; Gal. 1:13-17.

[3] Mt. 1-3; Lk. 1f.

[4] Norris, pp. 130f.

doctrinal reasons. One portion of a reading must be quoted while another portion is avoided.

Clement's treatment of I Corinthians 13:8 is an example of the principle of selectivity within a single verse. This verse is from a chapter which he quotes extensively. He carefully quotes the sixth and seventh verses, and the eighth verse through the words, "as for prophecy it will pass away; as for tongues they will cease." It is asking too much of Clement to approve the next phrase: "as for knowledge, it will pass away." He also passes over the following verses which speak of imperfect knowledge and prophecy and after inserting the words, "healings are left behind on earth [ἰάσεις ἐπὶ γῆς καταλείπονται]," he concludes his quotation with the thirteenth verse: "So faith, hope, love abide, these three, but the greatest of these is love."[1] This is deliberate selectivity, which could at least conceivably affect the text after Clement, and, though obvious, may be judged a textual variant due to doctrinal influence.

It is now possible to state that tradition is the source (at least in his assumption) of Clement's teaching. The principles for associating the higher meaning of the secret tradition with the parabolic meaning of written tradition are allegory, unity of the scriptures, and selectivity. Through these principles the true teaching, both written and unwritten of the one Logos becomes one consistent whole.

---

[1] QDS, 38, 2.

CHAPTER IV

VARIATION IN CLEMENT

The purpose of this chapter is to present evidence from Clement's writings bearing directly upon the hypothesis that certain of his variant readings in the New Testament are due to doctrinal influence.

The procedure is simple. Readings offering evidence have been selected from his writings and classified under the four headings of tradition, allegory, unity of Scripture, and selectivity. Some examples involve more than one classification. In order to avoid repetition on the one hand and inadequate presentation on the other, an example appears under only one classification. It is deemed important that each reading be seen in the context of Clement's thought.

This entire study is concerned with those variants of the New Testament text which appear to serve a doctrinal interest in Clement. This restricted interest eliminates from consideration the vast majority of variant readings in Clement's writings. Readings which are well attested in New Testament manuscripts or the Fathers will not be discussed here because they fail to distinguish variants which derive from Clement's principles of interpretation. All readings

have been checked against Tischendorf,[1] Legg,[2] and the readings of P^{45}, P^{46}, P^{47}, P^{66}, and P^{75}.[3]

As in the preceding chapters, the double or single quotation marks of Stählin are retained since they represent a judgment by Stählin of what Clement intended to quote directly. They are intended to be an aid to the reader. Omissions which may be of interest in the discussion of examples are indicated by a tick (ˇ). Additions to and alterations in the text which may hold a similar interest are indicated by underscoring (οὕτως). These indications are not a part of Stählin's text. They should be viewed only as flags which call attention to variants under discussion. In order to avoid confusion other variants which occur in these quotations are not indicated.

The readings which are chosen do not comprise all the

---

[1]Constantinus Tischendorf (ed.), Novum Testamentum Graece (editio octava critica maior; Lipsiae; Giesecke and Devrient, Vol. I, 1869; Vol. II, 1872; Vol. III, Prolegomena by Casparus Renatus Gregory, Lipsiae; J. C. Hinrichs, 1884).

[2]S. C. E. Legg (ed.), Novum Testamentum Graece secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum: Euangelium secundum Matthaeum (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1940).

[3]P^{45}, Frederic G. Kenyon (ed.), The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible (Fasciculus II, The Gospels and Acts; London: Emery Walker Ltd., 1933). P^{46}, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri (Fasciculus III, Supplement, Pauline Epistles, 1936). P^{47}, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyrus (Fasciculus III, Pauline Epistles and Revelation, 1934). P^{66}, Victor Martin (ed.), Papyrus Bodmer II (Gospel of John; Cologny-Genève: Bibliothèque Bodmer, 1956; Supplément, 1958). P^{75}, Victor Martin and Rodolphe Kasser (eds.), Papyrus Bodmer XIV, XV (Gospels of Luke and John, 1961).

possible doctrinal variants found in Clement's writings. They are representative illustrations chosen to demonstrate those doctrines and principles of interpretation which influenced Clement's textual aberrations.

All references to a particular verse under discussion are quoted at the beginning of each example in order that the reader may make his own evaluation and more readily follow the discussion.

Tradition

The term 'tradition' is used of both the written tradition found in Scripture and the unwritten tradition found in traditional teaching. The twofold task of the Gnostic was to understand sublimely what is heard and to explain the Scriptures according to the canon of truth. This truth is the tradition handed down from the Lord through the apostles. The gnosis which Clement offers in his writings is the 'mystery' which was imparted unwritten by the apostles and was handed down to the few. Tradition furnishes not only the solution to interpreting Scripture but also the barrier against excessive, unorthodox speculations. The proper interpretation of a passage depends not so much upon what the text says as upon true teaching founded upon true tradition. Biblical interpretation for Clement is the presentation of true teachings received from the apostles and authenticated by their writings. The higher meaning lay concealed allegorically

in the text, with it always being understood that what might be called a motivated textual variant today was intended by Clement to be no more than making clear the hidden intent of the text.

Matthew 5:6

Strom., I, i, 7, 2. τοὺς πεινῶντας ❜ δικαιοσύνην.

Strom., IV, vi, 25, 2. κἂν πεινῇ καὶ διψῇ διὰ δικαιοσύνην.

Strom., IV, vi, 26, 2. οὕτω δὲ καὶ τοὺς πεινῶντας καὶ τοὺς διψῶντας διὰ δικαιοσύνην μακαρίους λέγει.

Strom., IV, vi, 26, 3. κἂν τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτὴν πεινῶσι, μακάριοι.

Strom., V, xi, 70, 1. Εἰ τοίνυν λογικὸν ἡμῖν βρῶμα ἡ γνῶσις εἶναι συμπεφώνηται, ›μακάριοι‹ τῷ ὄντι κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν ›οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες‹ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὅτι πλησθήσονται τροφῆς αἰσίου.

QDS 17, 5. ›μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην τοῦ θεοῦ.‹

Ecl. Proph., 16, 4. μακάριοι γὰρ οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην τοῦ θεοῦ· οὗτοι γὰρ καὶ ἐμπλησθήσονται.

Clement quotes or alludes to this passage six times as 'hungering' (or 'hungering and thirsting') 'for' (or 'on account of') 'righteousness.' In one instance only[1] he quotes: "Blessed are those who hunger and thrist for truth." This is a deliberate change from the reading in the manuscript tradition. Although Stählin records τὴν ἀλήθειαν without quotation marks, Clement meant for it to be read as part of τῷ ὄντι κατὰ τὴν γραφήν.

---

[1] Strom., V, xi, 70, 1.

Clement is seeking to demonstrate that the "Greeks deify [ἐκθειάθουσι] the gnostic life [τὸν γνωστικὸν βίον]," although they do not know "how to become acquainted with it [ἐπίστασθαι χρή, 'how one ought to fix one's mind on it']." If we agree that "knowledge [ἡ γνῶσις] is the food of reason [λογικὸν βρῶμα (not 'rational,' not 'logical,' but 'divine food')]" then the blessed ones of which the Scripture speaks are those who "hunger and thirst after truth [τὴν ἀλήθειαν], for they shall be filled with everlasting food [τροφῆς ἀϊδίου]."

Although Clement alters the term, he seems to equate δικαιοσύνην with ἀλήθειαν: the Gnostic hungers and thirsts for the divine food by which the righteous shall live. Thus 'righteousness' and 'truth' are one and the same thing.

The same emphasis upon divine food causes Clement to substitute for χορτασθήσονται[1] the more fitting word, πλησθήσονται.[2]

There is no contextual need for the addition of the qualifying τοῦ θεοῦ with τὴν δικαιοσύνην,[3] but there is no question that Clement intended in both cases for this attribute to stand as a part of the quotations. Clement is making

---

[1]'To feed,' properly of animals; cf. χόρτασμα, 'fodder.'

[2]Strom., V, xi, 70, 1, πίμπλημι, 'to fill full, satisfy'; and in Ecl. proph., 14, 4, ἐμπλησθήσονται.

[3]Attested twice in QDS 17, 4 and Ecl. proph., 16, 4.

explicit that it is God's righteousness, not man's which we should desire.

The equating of 'righteousness' and 'truth' belongs to Clement's tradition. On this authority he reads the higher meaning into the text.

Matthew 5:15; cf. Mark 4:21;
Luke 8:16; 11:33; 14:24

Strom., I, i, 12, 3. ⟩οὐδεὶς ἅπτει λύχνον καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τίθησιν,⟨ ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῆς λυχνίας φαίνειν τοῖς τῆς ἑστιάσεως τῆς αὐτῆς κατηξιωμένοις.

In the introduction to the first book of The Stromateis Clement sets forth his reasons for writing down "the blessed tradition" which he received in order to preserve it from loss.[1] He recognizes the danger of being misunderstood and of his teachings being misused. The Lord "allowed us to communicate of those divine mysteries, and of that holy light [τοῦ φωτὸς ἐκείνου τοῦ ἁγίου], to those who are able to receive them [⟩τοῖς χωρεῖν δυναμένοις⟨]." Yet He did not disclose to the many what did not belong to the many; rather he disclosed the mysteries to the few "who were capable of receiving and being moulded according to them [τοῖς οἵοις τε ἐκδέξασθαι καὶ τυπωθῆναι πρὸς αὐτά]."[2]

Thus Clement with reservations sets his lamp upon the stand that it might give light "to those who have been deemed

---

[1] Strom., I, i, 12, 1.

[2] Strom., I, i, 13, 1f.

worthy of this banquet." It is only such men who are rightfully ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, who have been invited to 'the holy light.'

Titus[1] suggests that the phrase "those who have been deemed worthy of this banquet" may refer to the Eucharist, or Agape, or the festival life of the Gnostics; but any of these three would be completely foreign to Clement's immediate discussion. At this point Clement has in mind only his just-begun hazardous undertaking of setting down in writing what heretofore in his experience had been oral teaching. He exhibits no such fears in The Instructor or The Exhortation to the Greeks; the contents of these works were meant for the public. Clement struggles with three objections which make him reluctant to produce the material of The Stromateis in written form: (a) written and oral teachings differ, (b) his predecessors had not put such teachings in writing, and (c) a book is liable to suspicion and misuse.[2]

Clement does not write his Stromateis to be understood by all men. The lamp is concealed under a bushel. It is placed on its stand to reveal (φαίνειν, not λάμπειν) the hidden secrets of the tradition only to those who are deemed worthy (κατηξιωμένοις) of this banquet (τῆς ἑστιάσεως, a feast given by a citizen to his fellow citizens, as a λειτουργία).

---

[1]Eric Lane Titus, "The Motivation of Changes Made in the New Testament Text by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexander" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., 1942), p. 65.

[2]For a discussion of this, see Tollinton, I, 178-82.

Clement changes the meaning in Matthew from a 'light of the world' to the disclosing of divine mysteries to those who are able to receive them. The entire interpretation is based upon Clement's principle of tradition.

Matthew 8:12

Paed., I, x, 91, 1. οἱ δὲ ἁμαρτίαις περιπεσόντες, βληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων· καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια.

Matthew concludes three of the sayings of Jesus with the statement concerning those who are cast "into the outer darkness; there men will weep and gnash their teeth." In Matt. 8:12 it is "the sons of the kingdom" who are being cast out; in Matt. 22:13 it is the unprepared guest in the parable of the king's marriage feast; in Matt. 25:30 it is the servant who hid the one talent in the parable of the talents.

Clement associates the saying on casting into outer darkness with "those who fall into sin."

Matt. 8:12 uses the future passive, ἐκβληθήσονται. Matt. 22:13 and 25:30 both use the aorist active imperative, ἐκβάλετε. Clement uses the future passive, βληθήσονται. This would not be exceptionally significant were it not for the fact that Clement is seeking to show the methods whereby the Educator leads to repentance and restraint from sin. One method is to hold up examples of punishments from the past; the second method is to call attention to some conclusion drawn from present events; the third method (and the immediate

context of the quotation) "is drawn from future events." In other words we are "put on our guard" by being advised of the future punishment which awaits those who fail in repentance and restraint.

Only Matt. 8:12 is immediately concerned with a warning of future punishment. This saying in Matthew is the result of Jesus' marveling at the faith of the centurion. The natural implication is that outsiders through faith will enter the kingdom, while "the sons of the kingdom" through unbelief will become outsiders.

Clement is not writing of those who lack faith (nor of sons of the kingdom, or Jews). He is concerned here with those who sin: The Educator "uses encouragement to alleviate sins [τὰ ἁμαρτήματα], for by it He mitigates concupiscence and at the same time instils hope of salvation."[1]

Clement has understood, and wishes his reader to understand, that the Educator has warned us: 'Those who fall into sin will be cast into outer darkness . . .'

Matthew 10:26; Mark 4:22; Luke 8:17; 12:2; cf. Ephesians 5:13

Strom., I, i, 13, 3. κἄν τι λέγῃ γεγράφθαι οὐδὲν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερωθήσεται, οὐδὲ κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, ἀκουσάτω καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν, ὅτι τῷ κρυπτῶς ἐπαίοντι τὸ κρυπτὸν φανερωθήσεσθαι.

The word order of the first half of Mark 4:22 and

---

[1] Paed., I, x, 89, 1 - 91, 2.

Luke 8:17 is the same as the first half of the citation in Clement: Clement, κρυπτὸν equals Mark 4:22; Luke 8:17, κρυπτόν; Clement, φανερωθήσεται equals Mark 4:22, ἵνα φανερωθῇ, Luke 8:17, φανερὸν γενήσεται. However, Clement is decidedly different from the second half of both Mark 4:22 and Luke 8:17.

Syntactically Clement is in complete agreement with Matthew 10:26 and Luke 12:2. It is from this parallel saying that Clement is quoting. Nevertheless, Clement reverses the order of the two halves and substitutes φανερωθήσεται for γνωσθήσεται.

Clement is stating that "secret things [τὰ δὲ ἀπόρρητα ('forbidden, secret,' as the esoteric doctrines of the Pythagoreans or Eleusinian mysteries)] are entrusted to speech, not to writing." The divine mysteries (τῶν θείων μυστηρίων) were not for the many but for the few. If any should object that it is written, "'There is nothing secret [κρυπτόν] which shall not be revealed, nor hidden which shall not be disclosed,' let him hear from us, that to him who hears secretly [τῷ κρυπτῶν ἐπαΐοντι], even what is secret shall be manifested [τὸ κρυπτὸν φανερωθήσεσθαι]."

Clement has said that τὰ ἀπόρρητα are for the few. Since this is a non-biblical word, its biblical equivalent, κρυπτόν, would constitute the natural objection from Scripture. The immediate concern is: ⟩οὐδὲν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερωθήσεται.⟨ The two clauses are thus reversed. The

first clause in Matthew and Luke, which is parallel, is then treated as a further elucidation. Clement deals with this in confining the application to one "who is able secretly to observe what is delivered to him." For such a man, "that which is veiled [τὸ κεκαλυμμένον] shall be disclosed as truth [δηλωθήσεται . . . ὡς ἡ ἀλήθεια]." He then returns to his first concern in the citation by restricting the application in the following manner: "What is hidden to the many [τὸ τοῖς πολλοῖς κρυπτὸν], shall appear manifest to the few [τοῦτο τοῖς ὀλίγοις φανερὸν γενήσεται]."[1]

The second change involves the substitution of φανερωθήσεται for γνωσθήσεται. Clement understands γινώσκειν in the normal manner of knowledge by observation (in contra-distinction to οἶδα). Even in the passive this should not be understood as causal ('made known'). Thus, he makes the comparison between knowledge and faith: "Now to know is more than to believe [πλέον δέ ἐστι τοῦ πιστεῦσαι τὸ γνῶναι]."[2] And again he quotes Baruch:[3] "'We are happy, O Israel, because the things that are pleasing to God are made known to us,' made known through the Word [μακάριοί ἐσμεν, Ἰσραήλ, λέγων, ὅτι ἀρεστὰ τῷ θεῷ γνωστὰ (not 'are made known,' but 'are known things') ἡμῖν ἐστι, γνωστὰ δὲ διὰ τοῦ λόγου]."[4]

---

[1]Strom., I, i, 13, 1-3.

[2]Strom., VI, xiv, 109, 2.

[3]Baruch, 4, 4.

[4]Paed., I, ix, 91, 3.

Through the Word in manifestation the 'things pleasing to God' become for us 'known things.' The 'secret thing [κρυπτόν],' which for Clement is parallel with κεκαλυμμένον, can not be known (γνωσθήσεται) until it is made manifest (φανερωθήσεται). Clement appears to have picked up the thought of φανεροῦν from the reading in Mark 4:22 and Luke 8:17 where the idea is already associated with κρυπτόν.

The citation constitutes a unique reading in which Clement deliberately alters the word order and substitutes one word from a similar saying. In all of this he does no violence to the sense of the saying. It is in his exegesis that he confines its validity to only those who are able to 'hear secretly.'

Clement employs his principle of the unity of Scripture in combining Mark 4:22; Luke 8:17 with Matthew 10:26; Luke 12:2, and in substituting φανερωθήσεται from φανεροῦν in Mark 4:22; Luke 8:17. However, the entire discussion is based on his tradition, and his authority for the changes is derived from his principle of tradition.

Matthew 23:8-9

Paed., I, v, 17, 3. [v. 8] ›εἷς διδάσκαλος [v. 9] ἐν οὐρανοῖς.‹

Strom., I, i, 12, 3. [v. 8] ›εἷς γὰρ ὁ διδάσκαλος.‹

Strom., II, iv, 14, 3. [v. 8] ›μὴ εἴπητε ἑαυτοῖς διδάσκαλον [v. 9] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.‹

Strom., III, xii, 87, 4. [v. 9] ›εἷς μὲν οὖν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,‹ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπάντων πατὴρ κατὰ τὴν δημιουργίαν αὐτός. ›μὴ καλέσητε οὖν ὑμῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πατέρα.‹

Strom., VI, vii, 58, 2. [v. 8] ⸀μὴ εἴπητε ἑαυτοῖς διδάσκαλον [ ] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.⸁

QDS 23, 2. [v. 9] ⸀μὴ κάλει σεαυτῷ πατέρα ἐπὶ γῆς.⸁

Ecl. Proph., 20, 3. [v. 9] ⸀μὴ καλέσητε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς πατέρα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.⸁

In three of the four references to Matthew 23:8, Clement joins phrases from verse eight with verse nine. In the third such combination[1] Clement makes plain that he read both verses as parallel statements concerning the persons of διδάσκαλος and πατήρ. The angels have learned the truth (τὴν ἀλήθειαν). "It remains, then, for us, ascending to seek their teacher [διδάσκαλον]." Since the "unoriginated Being is one, the Omnipotent God [Ἓν μὲν τὸ ἀγέννητον ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεός]; one, too, is the First-begotten [Ἓν δὲ καὶ τὸ προγεννηθέν], 'by whom all things were made, and without whom not one thing ever was made.'"[2] Peter, in writing "for one, in truth, is God [⸀εἷς γὰρ τῷ ὄντι ἐστὶν ὁ θεός⸁], who formed the beginning of all things [⸀ὃς ἀρχὴν τῶν ἁπάντων ἐποίησεν⸁],"[3] points out (μηνύων 'discloses what is secret, reveals') the first-begotten Son (τὸν πρωτόγονον υἱόν). This one is called Wisdom (σοφία) by all the prophets. This one is "the Teacher [ὁ διδάσκαλος] of all created beings, the Fellow-counsellor of God [ὁ σύμβουλος τοῦ θεοῦ], who foreknew all things." He

---

[1] Strom., VI, vii, 58, 2.

[2] Jn. 1:3.

[3] Gospel of Peter, Fr. 2.

"trains [πεπαίδευκεν] and perfects [τελειοῖ]; whence it is rightly said, 'Call no man your teacher on earth.'"[1]

Clement would thus see verses eight and nine in some such connected fashion as: 'Call no man your teacher on earth, for you have one teacher who is in heaven (ὁ πρωτόγονος, σοφία, παιδαγωγός); and call no man your father on earth, for you have one Father, who is in heaven (τὸ ἀγέννητον ὁ εἷς παντοκράτωρ θεός).' There is one heavenly Teacher, one heavenly Father.

The oneness of the two persons may be seen in the following. Clement says that One is the "First-begotten, 'by whom all things were made.'"[2] Yet he also states that "'your father in heaven is one,' but he is also father of all men by creation [κατὰ τὴν δημιουργίαν]."[3]

Clement is teaching the unity of the Father and the Son. He could have chosen a more appropriate citation were it not for the fact that the context is concerned with the true 'teacher.' Because of this concern he selects the passage which contains "one teacher" and demonstrates the validity of that teacher in the unity of Father and Son. The authority for his variant is the principle of unity.

---

[1] Strom., VI, vii, 57, 5 - 58, 2.

[2] Strom., VI, vii, 58, 1.

[3] Strom., III, xii, 87, 4.

Mark 6:22; Matthew 7:7; Luke 11:9

Paed., III, vii, 40, 2. αἰτεῖσθαι καὶ λαμβάνειν ὧν ἂν δέηται παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων.

Strom., I, xi, 51, 4. ⟩ζητεῖτε⟩ γὰρ ⟩καὶ εὑρήσετε.⟨

Strom., II, xx, 116, 2. ⟩αἰτεῖσθε γὰρ καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.⟨

Strom., III, vii, 57, 2. ⟩αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.⟨

Strom., IV, ii, 5, 3. ⟩ζήτει⟨ φασὶ ⟩καὶ εὑρήσεις.⟨

Strom., V, i, 11, 1. ⟩ζήτει γάρ, καὶ εὑρήσεις⟨ λέγει.

Strom., V, iii, 16, 6. ⟩αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.⟨

Strom., VI, ix, 78, 1. ⟩αἴτησαι⟨ λέγων ⟩καὶ ποιήσω· ἐννοήθητι καὶ δώσω.⟨

Strom., VI, xii, 101, 4. ⟩αἴτησαι⟨, φησὶν ἡ γραφή, ⟩καὶ ποιήσω· ἐννοήθητι καὶ δώσω.⟨

Strom., VII, vii, 41, 4. ᾧ μόνῳ αἴτησις . . . γίνεται καὶ αἰτήσονται καὶ ἐννοηθέντι.

Strom., VII, xii, 73, 1. ⟩αἴτησαι καὶ δώσω σοί· ἐννοήθητι καὶ ποιήσω.⟨

Strom., VIII, i, 1, 2. ⟩ζητεῖτε⟨ εἶπεν ⟩καὶ εὑρήσετε, κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται, αἰτεῖσθε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.⟨

Clement's reading of Matthew 7:7; Luke 11:9 is evident in seven instances.[1] Twice in Stromateis, VI he gives the unique reading: ⟩αἴτησαι καὶ ποιήσω· ἐννοήθητι καὶ δώσω⟨.[2] In Stromateis, VII he gives a similar reading: ⟩αἴτησαι καὶ δώσω σοί· ἐννοήθητι καὶ ποιήσω⟨.[3]

---

[1] Strom., I, xi, 51, 4; II, xx, 116, 2; III, vii, 57, 2; IV, ii, 5, 3; V, i, 11, 1; V, iii, 16, 6; VIII, i, 1, 2.

[2] Strom., VI, ix, 78, 1; xii, 101, 4.

[3] Strom., VII, xii, 73, 1. Strom., VII, vii, 41, 4 indicates the same reading: αἰτήσονται καὶ ἐννοηθέντι.

Resch[1] remarks that the passage, if a citation, suggests Mark 6:22: αἴτησόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοι, Stählin treats the passage as a citation in all three instances.

It is proposed that the phrase, ⟩αἴτησαι καὶ δώσω σοί⟨, is a partial quotation of Mark 6:22, and that the thought was developed in the style of Matthew 7:7; Luke 11:9.

In the first occurrence[2] Clement is speaking of the simplicity of the gnostic life. "The Lord will not wait for the voice of this man in prayer. 'Ask,' He says, 'and I will do it; think and I will give.'"

This idea is more fully expressed in the second occurrence.[3] "But to those who live sinlessly and gnostically, He gives [δίδωσιν], when they have but merely entertained the thought [ἐννοησάμένοις μόνον]. For example, to Anna, on merely conceiving the thought [ἐννοηθέισῃ μόνον], conception was vouchsafed [ἐδόθη] of the child Samuel. 'Ask,' says the Scripture, 'and I will do. Think, and I will give.' For we have heard [παρειλήφαμεν ('we have received')[4]] that God knows the heart [⟩καρδιογνώστην⟨ γὰρ τὸν θεὸν (God who knows the hearts)[5]]."

---

[1]Alfred Resch, Agrapha: Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), Logion 14, p. 303.

[2]Strom., VI, ix, 78, 1.

[3]Strom., VI, xii, 101, 4.

[4]Cf. I Cor. 11:23, ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν.

[5]Cf. Acts 1:24; 15:8.

Clement is writing of the Gnostic whose whole life is a prayer to God. His will is so identified with God's and his communion so intimate that he may speak in the heart with God who knows the heart. It is not just the deeds of the outward man but even the inward thoughts which are offered up to God. Clement justifies the development of 'ask and I shall give' to 'think and I shall give' on the ground that he has 'received' through tradition the knowledge that God knows the hearts of men.

The third occurrence[1] is in an identical context: "For all his life is prayer and communion with God, and if he is free from sins he will assuredly receive what he desires. For God says to the righteous: 'Ask and I will give to thee; think and I will do.'"[2]

Clement clarifies his teaching of the Gnostic's inward prayer life in the following passage:

> On the other hand he is not wordy in his uttered prayers, since he has also been taught by the Lord what to ask for. Accordingly he will pray in every place, not however publicly or for all to see; but in every sort of way his prayer ascends, whether he is walking or in company or at rest or reading or engaged in good works; and though it be only a thought in the secret chamber of the heart, while he calls on the Father in groanings which cannot be uttered, yet the Father is nigh at hand, even before he has done speaking.[3]

---

[1] Strom., VII, xii, 73, 1.

[2] Cf. Tollinton, II, 92f.

[3] Strom., VII, vii, 49, 6-8.

Clement is not quoting this saying from another source. No indication of such a source has been discovered. The citation could be applied as an example of Clement's principle of the unity of Scripture. However, the citation goes beyond this to an example of the principle of the unity of all tradition. Clement is quoting the words of the Logos which he received in tradition, written and unwritten, "Ask and I shall give to thee, think and I shall do."

John 1:1

Protr., I, 6, 3. ›ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.‹

Protr., I, 6, 4. ›ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ λόγος ἦν.‹

Protr., I, 7, 3. ›ὁ λόγος [ὃς] ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν.‹

Protr., X, 110, 1. ›ὁ λόγος ἦν ἐν τῷ θεῷ.‹

Paed., I, viii, 62, 4. ›ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ λόγος ἦν ἐν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.‹

Strom., V, i, 1, 4. καὶ ἵνα τις πιστεύσῃ τῷ υἱῷ, γνῶναι δεῖ τὸν πατέρα πρὸς ὃν καὶ ὁ υἱός.

Exc. ex Theo., 6, 1. [Valentinian] ›ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.‹

Exc. ex Theo., 6, 3. [Valentinian] τῷ δὲ λόγῳ ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ Μονογενεῖ, ἐν τῷ Νῷ καὶ τῇ Ἀληθείᾳ, μηνύει τὸν Χριστὸν, τὸν Λόγον καὶ Ζωήν· ὅθεν εἰκότως καὶ αὐτὸν θεὸν λέγει τὸν ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ Νῷ ὄντα.

Exc. ex Theo., 19, 2. [Clement] τέκνον δὲ τοῦ ἐν ταὐτότητι λόγου ὁ σωτὴρ εἴρηται· διὰ τοῦτο ›ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν.‹

Clement gives the reading πρὸς τὸν θεόν five times and ἐν τῷ θεῷ twice.

The Logos is the Mediator between God and Cosmos.

God is

> unknowable and unrelated, and if it is through the Logos that He creates a world in time and space, and enters into fellowship with the finite and the transient, the Logos must be capable of activities which are incompatible with the nature of absolute Deity. Mediation, therefore, involves some degree and phase of subordination.[1]

Nevertheless, Clement is emphatic concerning the divine Unity. The Logos is God. "O, the great God; O, the perfect Child! Son, while He is Father [υἱὸς ἐν πατρί]; Father while He is Son [πατὴρ ἐν υἱῷ]."[2] "He is one and His Father is one [εἷς ὢν ἑνὸς ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς], the eternal beginning and end."[3] The Valentinians are answered: "But we maintain that the essential Logos is God in God [τὸν ἐν ταὐτότητι λόγον θεὸν ἐν θεῷ], who is also said to be 'in the bosom of the Father,'[4] continuous [ἀδιάστατος], undivided [ἀμέριστος], one God [εἷς θεός]."[5]

This insistence, born of controversy, leads Clement twice to alter πρὸς τὸν θεὸν to ἐν τῷ θεῷ.[6]

In the first instance[7] Clement is teaching the

---

[1]Tollinton, I, 345. Cf. Bigg, pp. 68f.

[2]Paed., I, v, 24, 3.

[3]Paed., II, viii, 75, 2.

[4]Jn. 1:18.

[5]Exc. ex Theo., 8, 1.

[6]Cf. Jn. 10:38, ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί.

[7]Protr., X, 110, 1.

greatness of the Word. Though in outward appearance He is despised, He is "the real Purifier, Saviour and Gracious One, the Divine Word [ὁ θεῖος λόγος], the truly most manifest God [ὁ φανερώτατος ὄντως θεός], who is made equal to the Master of the universe [ὁ τῷ δεσπότῃ τῶν ὅλων ἐξισωθείς], because He was His Son and 'the Word was in God [ἐν τῷ θεῷ].'"

In the second instance[1] Clement is refuting the Marcionite teaching that the Old Testament God is inferior in that he demonstrates hate instead of love. "If the Word hates anything, His will is that it not exist: there is nothing in existence for which God is not the cause. It must be, then, that there is nothing that God hates, nothing that the Word hates. Both are one, and both are God [ἓν γὰρ ἄμφω, ὁ θεός], because Scripture says: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was in God [ἐν τῷ θεῷ], and the Word was God."

Clement by no means rejects πρὸς τὸν θεόν. Twice he feels the need of emphasizing the fact that being 'with God' implies being 'in God.' Clement is not borrowing from some such phrase as ἐν τῷ πατρί in John 10:38. His tradition, as over against the traditions of the heretics, has insisted upon the divine Unity. For Clement, what he has received makes evident that ὁ λόγος was ἐν τῷ θεῷ.

---

[1] Paed., I, viii, 62, 4.

Paed., I, vi, 28, 3. σύμφημι κἀγώ, πλὴν ἐν φωτί ἐστιν καὶ τὸ σκότος αὐτὸν οὐ καταλαμβάνει.

Paed., II, ix, 79, 3. ὁ δὲ τὸ φῶς ἔξων ἐγρήγορεν, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸν οὐ καταλαμβάνει.

Paed., II, x, 99, 6. μηδαμῶς τοίνυν ἐπικαλυπτώμεθα τὸ σκότος, τὸ γὰρ φῶς ἔνοικον ἡμῖν· ›καὶ ἡ σκοτία‹, φησίν, ›αὐτὸ οὐ καταλαμβάνει.‹

Exc. ex Theo., 8, 4. [Clement] ›καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸν οὐ κατέλαβεν.‹

In the fourth occurrence[1] Clement is asserting that the "essential Only-Begotten [ὁ ἐν ταυτότητι μονογενής] . . . is the Light of the Church [οὗτός ἐστι ›τὸ φῶς‹ τῆς ἐκκλησίας] which previously was in darkness and ignorance [ἐν σκότῳ καὶ ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ]." Therefore the phrase "and darkness comprehended him not [αὐτὸν (i.e., ὁ μονογενής) οὐ κατέλαβεν (aorist; here 'comprehended,' cf. οὐκ ἔγνωσαν αὐτόν which follows immediately)]" is interpreted as pointing to "the apostates and the rest of men [οἱ ἀποστατήσαντες καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων(i.e., those who are still ἐν σκότῳ καὶ ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ)]" who "did not know him [οὐκ ἔγνωσαν αὐτόν]." Here Clement identifies the light with the Logos as in John.

In the first three instances Clement develops the idea of the light which came in the Logos into the idea of the light which, as a result of the Logos having come, is now coming into the lives of men.[2]

---

[1] Exc. ex Theo., 8, 4.

[2] Cf. Kutter, p. 34.

In the first occurrence[1] Clement is writing of baptism. "When we are baptized, we are enlightened [φωτιζόμεθα]; being enlightened, we become adopted sons; becoming adopted sons, we are made perfect; and becoming perfect, we are made divine."[2] Having been enlightened in this rebirth, "he is straightway [παραχρῆμα] rid of darkness [ἀπήλλακται τοῦ σκότους] . . . and automatically receives light [τὸ φῶς]."[3] Clement agrees that baptism does not grant the gift of perfection, but he insists that the baptized "is already in the light [ἐν φωτί] and that darkness does not overtake [οὐ καταλαμβάνει (present)] him [αὐτὸν (i.e., the baptized)]."

In the second occurrence[4] Clement is giving instruction on proper sleep habits. The Christian should sleep half-awake, arousing himself from sleep often and giving praise to God. "He who has the light [ὁ δὲ τὸ φῶς ἔχων] stays awake, and the darkness does not overcome [ἡ σκοτία οὐ καταλαμβάνει] him [αὐτὸν (the Christian who has been baptized and thus has the light)]."

In the third occurrence[5] Clement is speaking of those who think to hide their sins in darkness. But the light which

---

[1]Paed., I, vi, 28, 3.

[2]Paed., I, vi, 26, 1.

[3]Paed., I, vi, 27, 3.

[4]Paed., II, ix, 79, 3.

[5]Paed., II, x, 99, 6.

illumines the mind cannot be ignored. "Let us not, then, allow ourselves to be swallowed up in any way by darkness, for light dwells [ἔνοικον] in us: 'And darkness,' Scripture says, 'did not overcome [οὐ καταλαμβάνει ('is not overcoming')] it [αὐτὸ (i.e., τὸ φῶς)].'"

The first three instances, in which καταλαμβάνει is used, refer to the illumination of Christians as a present, continuous gift from God. The work which Christ initiated is now being sustained by the Holy Spirit. Clement witnesses to the fact that Christians experience the gift of light.

Clement might have drawn his argument from John 1:9: "The true light that enlightens [ὃ φωτίζει] every man was coming into the world." The tense of φωτίζει would justify καταλαμβάνει. However, there is no indication that Clement made this association. φῶς is an important attribute to the gnostic life. It is received at baptism and continues as the guide for σώφρων λογισμός.[1] The small alteration of the tense involves a major doctrinal tenet of Clement. The change is based upon Clement's tradition.

John 10:11

Protr., XI, 116, 1. ταύτῃ καὶ τὸν ἀγαθὸν ποιμένα ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεός.

Paed., I, vi, 37, 3. εἴ τε ποιμένες [ἐσ]μὲν οἱ τῶν ἐκκλησίων προηγούμενοι κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ποιμένος.

Paed., I, vii, 53, 2. ⟨ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός.⟩

---

[1] Paed., II, x, 99, 6.

Paed., I, ix, 85, 2. τοῦτον γὰρ μόνον ὁμολογεῖ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι ποιμένα.

Paed., I, xi, 97, 3. »ὁ γὰρ ἀγαθὸς ποιμὴν τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων.«

Strom., I, xxvi, 169, 1. »[οὕτω γὰρ] ὁ ἀγαθὸς ποιμὴν τὴν ψυχὴν τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων.«

Exc. ex Theo., 73, 2. [Theodotus] ὥσπερ ὁ ἀγαθὸς ποιμήν.

In only one instance[1] does Clement use the phrase ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός. He is identifying the Educator: "He is called Jesus. On occasion, He speaks of Himself as a Shepherd, as when He says: 'I am the Good Shepherd [ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός].'" This represents a formal declaration by the Educator concerning his identity. Clement is exact in the quotation.

In five other instances Clement changes the phrase to read ὁ ἀγαθὸς ποιμήν. There is a decided preference for this reading. Titus[2] suggests that Clement preferred ἀγαθός because καλός represents primarily the beautiful and only secondarily moral goodness.

Titus' understanding is possible, but another explanation is more probable. Clement accepts the tradition of the uncomely Jesus which developed from the figure of Isaiah's suffering servant. He speaks of the Lord who was 'in outward appearance despised [ὄψει καταφρονούμενος].'[3]

---

[1] Paed., I, vii, 53, 2.

[2] Titus, p. 55.

[3] Protr., X, 110, 1. Cf. Is. 53:3.

Love (ἀγάπη) is the beauty for men (κάλλος ἀνθρώπων). "The Spirit gives witness through Isaias that even the Lord became an unsightly spectacle [τὴν ὄψιν αἰσχρὸν]: 'And we saw Him and there was no beauty [οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος] or comliness [οὐδὲ κάλλος] in Him, but His form was despised, and abject of men.'[1] . . . He displayed not beauty of the flesh [οὐ τὸ κάλλος τοῦ σαρκὸς], which is only outward appearance, but the true beauty of body and soul: for the soul, the beauty of good deeds [τὸ . . . κάλλος . . . τὸ εὐεργετικόν]; for the body, that of immortality."[2] For Clement, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τῆς ψυχῆς κάλλος, which is ἀγάπη, is more conveniently expressed as ἀγαθός.

Here again one might see the principle of unity of Scripture in which Isaiah 53:3 influences the use of ἀγαθός in John 10:11. However, ἀγαθόςdoes not even appear in Isaiah 53:3. Clement uses the adjective in five out of six citations of John 10:11. This is an example of the principle of tradition. Clement's tradition of the uncomely Jesus used the figure of Isaiah's suffering servant, but it is the tradition itself which causes Clement to prefer ἀγαθός in John 10:11.

From the above it is evident that Clement is dependent upon some source for his teaching which lies beyond the literal meaning of the passages which he cites. His citations are

---

[1] LXX, Is. 53:2.

[2] Paed., III, i, 3, 3.

authoritative, and they are quoted for this reason, but they are not necessarily the source of his teaching. His source is the true tradition, both written and unwritten. The gnosis which he seeks to communicate is based upon his secret tradition which is concealed within the written tradition.

Clement does not understand his biblical interpretation as discovering through his ingenuity the hidden meaning within the written tradition. He does not understand his biblical interpretation as seeking the written tradition for some tenuous support of his beliefs. Both traditions are one tradition. They both speak the same truth in different ways (the one concealed, the other revealed). It has been shown that the very association of a particular teaching with a particular citation is often itself a part of Clement's tradition.

Since the written tradition spoke in a parabolic manner what was revealed in the unwritten tradition, there is a close connection between the principle of tradition and the second classification of allegory.

Allegory

The classification of allegory includes examples which further demonstrate that Clement understood his teaching as traditional elucidation of the higher meaning of the text. In the discussion of chapter two it was determined that Clement held a four-fold sense of Scripture. Beyond

the literal meaning (historical) the three interpretative meanings (the sign, the precept for right conduct, and prophecy) were treated allegorically by Clement. It was, therefore, considered best to treat all of Clement's metaphorical interpretations as allegorical.

Clement shared the Hellenistic view of the spiritual meaning hidden in the sensible. Although he demonstrates a lack of allegorical methodology to control the association of the spiritual meaning with the sensible, his teachings are generally orthodox and often evince Semitic roots which he does not always appear to fully understand. It is concluded that Clement inherited through Judaism and Christianity a rich legacy of traditional interpretation. His allegory is often fanciful; his teaching drawn from allegory is usually sound. One is tempted to assume that Clement knew the answer before his text had stated the problem.

Matthew 4:4; cf. Luke 4:4
(Deuteronomy 8:3; Habakkuk 2:4)

Paed., II, i, 7, 2. ›οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ ˘ ζήσεται ὁ δίκαιος.‹

Paed., III, vii, 40, 1. ›οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ δίκαιος, ἀλλ' ἐν ˘ παντὶ ῥήματι ˘ κυρίου.‹

In both citations Clement substitutes ὁ δίκαιος for ὁ ἄνθρωπος. This is not only a reading found only in Clement, but it is attested twice.

The context indicates why Clement makes this change. He is contrasting the eating habits of Christians (whom the

Educator has commanded to eat in order to live) with the habit of the "other men [ἄλλοι ἄνθρωποι]" who live to eat as unreasoning beasts.[1] Christians are to seek a "heavenly food [τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἐπουράνιον],"[2] "a banquet of the Word [ἑστίασις λογική].[3] They are to eat of the feast of δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ that they might possess the kingdom of God[4] and "become accustomed to the food of eternity [εἰς ἀίδιον τροφήν]."[5] Thus it is 'the righteous,' not merely 'the man,' who shall not live by bread.

In the second citation[6] Clement is answering the objection that the righteous (ὁ δίκαιος) is often seen in need of food (ἄρτου). He replies that this is rare and only happens when there is not another righteous man (ἄλλος δίκαιος). He then reminds us that "the righteous does not live by bread alone, but by the Word of the Lord."[7]

The allegorical meaning of "man" is "the righteous."

---

[1] Paed., II, i, 1, 4.

[2] Paed., II, i, 4, 2.

[3] Paed., II, i, 5, 3.

[4] Paed., II, i, 6, 2; quoting Rom. 14:17.

[5] Paed., II, i, 7, 1.

[6] Paed., III, vii, 40, 1.

[7] He writes "of the Lord" instead of "from the mouth of God." He means "the Lord Jesus" since he qualifies "the Lord" with "who is the true bread, the bread of heaven." (Cf. Jn. 6:33, 41.)

Matthew 5:36

Paed., III, iii, 16, 4. οὐδεὶς δὲ ἄλλος, φησὶν ὁ κύριος, «δύναται ποιῆσαι ἓν τρίχα λευκὴν ἢ μέλαιναν.»

Clement is excoriating those men who in vanity seek to conceal their age through dyeing their gray hair. Gray hair is a sign of old age, and dyeing the hair is no escape from old age and death. No one but God "is able to make hair black or white."

The quotation is lifted completely out of its context in Matthew. Its appropriateness lies wholly in the mention of black and white hair. Since μίαν would have made the citation ridiculous, Clement omits the adjective and reads τρίχα as a collective singular.

This is a ludicrous misuse of Scripture. For Clement it was quite proper to reason that when the Lord said that men cannot change the color of one hair, He prohibited the dyeing of hair.

The omission of "one" constitutes an example of the principle of selectivity. However, the interpretation is allegorical.

Matthew 6:21; cf. Luke 12:34

Strom., IV, vi, 33, 5f. ὁ δὲ τῷ ὄντι θησαυρὸς ἡμῶν ἔνθα ἡ συγγένεια τοῦ νοῦ.

Strom., VII, xiii, 77, 5. («ὅπου γὰρ ὁ νοῦς τινος», φησίν, «ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ θησαυρὸς αὐτοῦ.»)

QDS 17, 1. «ὅπου γὰρ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ θησαυρὸς αὐτοῦ.»

There is nothing unusual about Clement's substituting νοῦς[1] for καρδία. It is a common practice in the Septuagint to translate leb, lebab with νοῦς. Justin Martyr[2] had already given the reading: »ὅπου γὰρ ὁ θησαυρός ἐστιν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ νοῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.« Moreover, Clement appears to have known the reading »ἡ καρδία«:

> But he who carries his wealth in his soul, and in place of God's spirit carries in his heart [ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ] gold or an estate . . . how can he desire or meditate on the kingdom of heaven? A man that bears about not a heart [οὐ καρδίαν], but an estate or mine, will he not perforce be found among those things on which he fixed his choice? "For where the mind [ὁ νοῦς] of man is, there is his treasure also."[3]

The variant unique with Clement is the reversal of the two clauses. In Matthew and Luke the verse is a part of a saying on the laying up of treasures in heaven. 'Where one's treasure is deposited, there also will be one's heart.' Clement turns the meaning around: 'where one's νοῦς is, there also is his treasure.'

The Gnostic gains mastery over his worldly desire and thus becomes fully persuaded that he holds the unseen future "more immediately present than the things which are actually

---

[1]Not 'mind' here, but more like Paul's πνεῦμα. E.g., I Cor. 2:16, "but we have the mind of Christ [νοῦν Χριστοῦ]," referring to the πνευματικοὶ (v. 15) who have received τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 14).

[2]Justin Martyr, Apology, I, 15.

[3]QDS 17, 1.

before him."[1] "When he gets hold of a scientific principle, he believes that he sees the Lord, while he directs his eyes to the unseen." He directs his vision to see nothing unsuited to the Gnostic, and thus trains himself to look on "beauty alone apart from fleshly pleasure." The Lord has willed him "to have in mind" holiness and beauty. "Thus he never sees even in a dream which is unsuited to an elect soul." He prefers (προκρίνων, 'chooses above all others') "these things from those which he has believed to exist [ταῦτα ἐξ ὧν εἶναι πεπίστευκεν]."[2]

The point which Clement is making is that the Gnostic rejects worldly things, "the things which are actually before him," and directs his mind to those unseen things which through faith he knows to exist. This "unseen future," which he holds at present only in the νοῦς is his "treasure in heaven."[3]

Matthew 11:16-17; Luke 7:32

Paed., I, v, 13, 3. αὐθίς τε παιδίοις ὁμοιοῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐν ἀγοραῖς καθημένοις καὶ λέγουσιν, ηὐλήσαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε, ἐθρηνήσαμεν καὶ οὐκ ἐκόψασθε [Mt.; Lk. has ἐκλαύσατε].

In Matthew and Luke this saying of Jesus is one of a

---

[1] Strom., VII, xii, 74, 9.

[2] Mayer and Chadwick, in their translation of this passage (Alexandrian Christianity, p. 142), appear to miss the exact meaning: "preferring those things on which he believes that his life depends."

[3] Strom., VII, xii, 75, 1 - 77, 6.

collection of sayings concerning John the Baptist. In the saying Jesus compares "this generation" (or "the men of this generation") to the children in the market places. The comparison is uncomplimentary to "this generation."

Clement is seeking to prove that the Scriptures mean 'Christians' when they speak of 'children.' He cites six instances from the Gospels in which he takes 'children' to indicate followers of Christ. His seventh and last citation from the Gospels is the present example in which he asserts that Jesus "likened the kingdom of heaven to 'children seated in the market-places. . . .'"[1]

This is a doctrinal variant which Clement employs in the very act of collecting proof-texts to prove that Jesus is indicating his followers when he speaks of 'children.' It is a deliberate alteration of a text which has no association outside the word παιδίοις and completely changes its meaning. The change can thus not be explained away as paraphrase or an attempt to make the meaning of the passage relevant. Neither can the error be excused by assuming that the citation does not begin until the words »ἐν ἀγοραῖς καθημένοις,« since these words constitute a qualifying phrase of παιδίοις. Barnard kindly suggests that the change "is a strange slip of memory."[2] Henri-Irénée Marrou judges Clement's change as intentional:

---

[1] Paed., I, v, 12, 1 - 13, 3.

[2] Barnard, p. 15.

In his ardour to make use of all his references to the word "children," Clement transposes the meaning of this text which speaks not of the Kingdom of heaven but, pejoratively, of "this perverse generation," the disbelieving auditors of John the Baptist and Jesus.[1]

The interpretation is allegorical.

Matthew 11:19; Luke 7:34

Paed., II, ii, 32, 4. ›ἦλθεν γάρ‹, φησίν, ›ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ˘ καὶ λέγουσιν· ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος ˘ .‹

Strom., III, vi, 52, 4. ›ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγουσι· ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶς.‹

In both quotations Clement fails to include the accusation that Jesus was a "friend of sinners."

In the first example[2] Clement is insisting that, though Jesus drank wine, he drank "with good manners, with dignity, and leisurely." The point of the quotation is that Jesus was accused, with some, but not sufficient, justification, of being an οἰνοπότης. There is no reason for including the further fact that he was a "friend of sinners." On the other hand, Clement includes τελωνῶν φίλος.[3]

---

[1]Clément d'Alexandrie, Le Pédagogue, Livre I, introduction and notes by Henri-Irénée Marrou, translation by Marguerite Harl (Sources Chrétiennes, No. 70. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1960), p. 134.

[2]Paed., II, ii, 32, 4.

[3]This reading is not unique: 142* and a also omit ἁμαρτωλῶν.

The second example[1] indicates that Clement knew the reading ἁμαρτωλῶν. He is presenting a counter argument against the ascetics of his day. The immediate context consists of examples of righteous men in scripture who married, ate, and drank. "The Lord says of himself: '. . . the Son of man came eating and drinking. . . .'" Those "who under a pious cloak blaspheme by their continence [δι' ἐγκρατείας (the whole of chapter VI is directed against the Encratites[2])] both the creation and the holy Creator, the almighty, only God"[3] are the equivalents of those whom the Lord himself accuses of calling him "a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and a sinner [καὶ ἁμαρτολός]." Since Jesus admits that he came eating and drinking, the Encratites in their teaching of austere asceticism blaspheme the Lord by, in effect, calling him a 'glutton, drunkard, a friend of tax collectors,' and, as a consequence, 'a sinner.'

This is not a case of the omission of καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν in Clement's text. It is not an expression of concern on the part of Clement that Christians should not associate with "sinners."[4] Through the simple expedient of changing

---

[1]Strom., III, vi, 52, 4.

[2]Note the connection with the first example. After quoting Mt. 11:19 Clement adds: "This is a quotation we can use to make the Encratites [τοὺς Ἐγκρατητὰς] look ridiculous."

[3]Strom., III, vi, 45, 1.

[4]Titus, p. 41.

ἁμαρτωλῶν to ἁμαρτωλός (a unique reading), Clement is able to turn the words of Jesus into an accusation against a contemporary sect.

Although the alteration involves only the changing of one letter, the new meaning is derived through the principle of allegory.

Matthew 11:28-30

Protr., I, 3, 2. ὡς δὲ τὸν πρᾶον καὶ φιλάνθρωπον τῆς θεοσεβείας μετάγων ἡμᾶς ζυγὸν αὐθις εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνακαλεῖται τοὺς εἰς γῆν ἐρριμμένους.

Protr., XII, 120, 5. »δεῦτε πρός με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς· ἄρατε τὸν ζυγόν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς καὶ μάθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι πραΰς εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, καὶ εὑρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν· ὁ γὰρ ζυγός μου χρηστὸς καὶ τὸ φορτίον μου ἐλαφρόν ἐστιν.«

Paed., I, x, 91, 2. »δεῦτε πρός με πάντας οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς.«

Strom., II, v, 22, 5. »ἄρατε«, φησίν, »ἀφ' ὑμῶν τὸν βαρὺν ζυγὸν καὶ λάβετε τὸν πρᾶον,« ἡ γραφή φησι.

Strom., II, xx, 126, 3. οὕτω τοίνυν ἡμᾶς εὐλαβῶς προσιέναι πειρωμένους ἐκδέξεται ὁ »χρηστὸς« τοῦ κυρίου »ζυγός.«

Strom., V, v, 30, 3. διὰ τοῦτο ὁ κύριος »ἄρατε τὸν ζυγόν μου«, φησίν, »ὅτι χρηστός ἐστι καὶ ἁβαρής.«

There is no question of Clement's text, as he quotes the entire saying word for word.[1] Nevertheless, he changes the reading twice.

In the first instance[2] Clement is furnishing evidence

---

[1] Protr., XII, 120, 5.

[2] Strom., II, v, 22, 5.

that the Greeks received their knowledge from Scripture. Plato has called "vice [τὴν κακίαν] a servile thing [δουλοπρεπές ('a thing befitting a slave')] and virtue [τὴν ἀρετήν] the attribute of free men [ἐλευθεροπρεπές]."[1] So also the poets call vice "a slavish yoke [δούλειον ζυγόν]."[2] But Scripture says, "Take away from you the heavy yoke [τὸν βαρὺν ζυγόν], and take up the easy one [τὸν πρᾶον]."

Plato has distinguished between that which is 'befitting a slave' and that which is 'worthy of a freeman.' This is what the poets mean when they speak of a δούλειον ζυγόν.[3] The δούλειον ζυγόν is the βαρὺν ζυγόν which Scripture enjoins: "Take away from you [ἄρατε ἀφ' ὑμῶν (changing ἐφ' to ἀφ')]." Βαρύν is probably justified in that the true yoke is both πρᾶον and ἐλαφρόν.[4] The yoke 'worthy of a freeman' is τὸν πρᾶον.

In the second instance,[5] Clement has returned to the same argument that all true knowledge has been mediated through Scripture. Pythagoras "made an epitome of the

---

[1]Plato, Alcibides, I, 135 C.

[2]Cf. Aeschylos, The Seven against Thebes, 75, "Grant that they never hold in yoke of bondage [ζεύγλῃσι δουλίῃσι (and the varient reading, ζυγοῖσε δολέουσι)]"; The Persians, 50, "Eager to bind on Greece the servile yoke [ζυγὸν δούλιον]"; Herodotus, VII, 8, "They . . . will alike bear the yoke of slavery [δούλιον ζυγόν]."

[3]See also Protr., II, 35, 1.

[4]But it is Jesus, not the yoke, who is πραΰς.

[5]Strom., V, v, 30, 3.

statements on righteousness in Moses, when he said, 'Do not overstep the balance [ζυγὸν μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν].'[1]" This 'balance' Clement explains as the "equality in distribution [τὸ πρὸς τὰς διανομὰς ἴσον], honoring justice [τιμῶντας τὴν δικαιοσύνην]." In this same light Jesus says, "Take my yoke [τὸν ζυγὸν (or 'balance')], for it is gentle [χρηστός (perhaps in this context with the meaning of 'good, benevolent, kind, loving')] and light [ἀβαρής (perhaps with the meaning of 'not offensive, not oppressive, not cruel')]."

Clement takes the symbol of the yoke (balance) to represent the Mosaic (and biblical) teaching of δικαιοσύνη (as in the Old Testament use of mishpat). The substitution of ἀβαρής for ἐλαφρόν provides a synonym with overtones conducive to the interpretation.

Both of these examples are clearly illustrations of variants instigated by Clement's doctrine that all true knowledge comes from God and the consequent teaching of the theft of knowledge by the pagan Greek writers. The method of interpretation employed by Clement is allegorical. The hidden truth is concealed in the word. Clement has justified such treatment in his statement:

> Whatever the explication necessary on the point in hand shall demand, shall be embraced, and especially what is occult [τὸ ἐπικεκρυμμένον] in the barbarian philosophy, the department of symbol and

---

[1]Phthagoras, Symbols, 2.

enigma [τὸ συμβολικὸν τοῦτο καὶ αἰνιγματῶδες εἶδος, 'this symbolic and enigmatic form'].[1]

Matthew 15:8; Mark 7:6; Isaiah 29:13

Paed., I, ix, 76, 4. »ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσί με, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἐστὶν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.«

Paed., II, viii, 62, 5. »ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσι φιλοῦσί με, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πορρωτέρω ἐστὶν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.«

Strom., II, xiv, 61, 3. »ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσί με τιμᾷ» φησίν, »ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἐστὶν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.«

Strom., IV, vi, 32, 4. »ὁ γὰρ λαὸς ὁ ἕτερος τοῖς χείλεσι τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτοῦ πόρρω ἄπεστιν ἀπὸ κυρίου.«

Strom., IV, vii, 43, 3. ὁ μὲν γὰρ τοῖς χείλεσιν ἀγαπῶν λαός, τὴν δὲ καρδίαν μακρὰν ἔχων ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἄλλος ἐστίν.

Strom., IV, xviii, 112, 1. ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ὁ λαὸς ὁ τοῖς χείλεσιν ἀγαπῶν.

Clement uses τιμῶσι from Isaiah or τιμᾷ from Matthew and Mark three times. He substitutes ἀγαπῶν in two paraphrased readings. However, this is not unique in the Markan reading.[2]

In one instance[3] he substitutes φιλοῦσι. Clement is giving an allegorical interpretation of the anointing of the feet of Jesus.[4] He interprets the myrrh as the traitor Judas. "This same Judas betrayed the Master with a kiss [φιλήματι];

---

[1] Strom., II, i, 1, 2.

[2] Mk. 7:6, αγαπα, D^{gr} a b c.

[3] Paed., II, viii, 62, 5.

[4] Mt. 26:6-13; Mk. 14:3-9; Lk. 7:36-50; Jn. 12:1-8.

he became a hypocrite, imitating [μεμούμενος] with his treacherous kiss [φίλημα δεδολωμένον] the hypocrite of old"; ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσι φιλοῦσί με, although "their hearts are far from me."

Clement knew both readings employing τιμᾶν and ἀγαπᾶν. In order more fittingly to bring out the connection of this prophecy with Judas, he employs the synonym of φιλεῖν to indicate more clearly the φίλημα which Judas bestowed τοῖς χείλεσι.[1]

The original meaning has been changed from honoring (or loving) with <u>words</u> of the lips to a <u>kiss</u> of the lips. Isaiah may not have known the person of Judas or of his act of betrayal. But Jesus, in applying the prophecy to himself, makes clear to Clement that the spirit speaking through Isaiah was referring to Judas. This interpretation of Clement illustrates the assumption of the allegorical principle, namely that the original speaker in all probability was not cognizant of the full import of his words. It is the task of the interpreter to make clear the true and hidden meaning.

Matthew 19:24; Mark 10:25; Luke 18:25

<u>QDS</u> 2, 2. ἀκούσαντες τῆς τοῦ κυρίου φωνῆς, ὅτι ῥᾷον κάμηλος διὰ τρήματος ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιος εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

---

[1] τιμᾶν, 'to honor, revere'; ἀγαπᾶν, 'to love, cherish'; φιλεῖν, here 'to show outward signs of love,' thus 'to kiss,' as a special indication of love (in this use of Clement as a false or hypocritical act).

QDS 26, 7. εἰ δὲ μή, φᾶττον κάμηλος διὰ ᾽ βελόνης εἰσελεύσεται ἢ ὁ τοιοῦτος πλούσιος ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ παρελεύσεται.

Strom., II, v, 22, 3. πειστέον οὖν πολλῷ μᾶλλον τῇ γραφῇ λεγούσῃ φᾶττον ⟩κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος βελόνης⟨ διελεύσεσθαι ἢ πλούσιον φιλοσοφεῖν.

In the first occurrence[1] Clement's reading agrees with Matthew against Mark and Luke twice (τῶν οὐρανῶν and the omission of final εἰσελθεῖν), with Matthew and Mark against Luke once (ῥαφίδος), and with Luke against Matthew and Mark once (τρήματος). In the second occurrence[2] his reading agrees with Matthew and Luke against Mark once (εἰσελεύσεται), with Mark and Luke against Matthew once (τοῦ θεοῦ), and with Luke against Matthew and Mark once (βελόνης). In the third occurrence[3] his reading agrees with Matthew against Mark and Luke once (τρυπήματος), with Mark against Matthew and Luke once (διελεύσεσθαι), and with Luke against Matthew and Mark once (βελόνης). This indicates that Clement is quoting freely from memory.

In the first occurrence[4] Clement is explaining why salvation seems difficult for rich men. They despair of themselves in hearing that "a camel shall more easily creep through [διεκδύσεται] a needle's eye than a rich man [shall creep through] into the kingdom of heaven." Instead of escaping from the world and this present life to salvation,

---

[1] QDS 2, 2. [2] QDS 26, 7.

[3] Strom., II, v, 22, 3.

[4] QDS 2, 2.

"complying with the world in everything, and clinging to the present life as the only one left to them, they depart further from the heavenward way."

For διελθεῖν (εἰσελθεῖν) Clement substitutes διεκδύσεται ('to slip out through, to plunge out through,' cf., ἡ διέκδυσις, 'a means of escape, an escape hole' as in διεκδύσεις μυῶν, 'mouse-holes'). Clement is summarizing within the saying his teaching that one cannot cling to the things of this life and still plunge through the escape hole to salvation.

In the third occurrence[1] Clement is seeking to show that Plato was only assenting to the teachings of Moses when he said, "For the very rich to be also good is impossible [πλουσίους δ' αὖ σπόδρα εἶναι καὶ ἀγαθοὺς ἀδύνατον]."[2] This is the proper understanding of the saying, "'It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man' to lead a philosophic life [φιλοσοφεῖν]." There is no problem of associating φιλοσοφεῖν with ἀγαθός in Plato, and, for Clement, it was natural to associate this idea with ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

Clement states that the camel which "passes through the straight and narrow way"[3] must be understood to have "some higher meaning" as a "mystery [μυστήριον]" of the

---

[1] Strom., II, v, 22, 3.

[2] Plato, Laws V, 742 E.

[3] Mt. 7:14.

Savior. For this meaning he refers to his Exposition concerning First Principles and Theology.[1] A rich man is not condemned beforehand, but he must learn "in what manner wealth is to be used and life acquired."[2]

Stromateis, II, v, 22, 3 is a clear example of the principle of allegorical interpretation. φιλοσοφεῖν is the allegorical meaning of εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

I Corinthians 3:1-2

Paed., I, vi, 34, 3. ›γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, ὡς, νηπίους ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ βρῶμα· οὔπω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἔτι νῦν δύνασθε.‹

Paed., I, vi, 35, 2. ›γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα ἐν Χριστῷ‹ καὶ διαστήσαντες ὀλίγον ἐπαγάγωμεν ›ὡς νηπίους.‹

Paed., I, vi, 36, 2. ›κἀγὼ δέ, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐδυνήθην λαλῆσαι ὑμῖν ὡς πνευματικοῖς, ἀλλ' ὡς σαρκίνοις, ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ.‹

Paed., I, vi, 36, 4. ›γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα.‹

Paed., I, vi, 36, 5. ›γάλα‹ εἰπῶν ›ἐπότισα‹ . . . ›οὐ βρῶμα, οὔπω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε.‹

Paed., I, vi, 36, 6. ›ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἔτι νῦν δύνασθε. . . .‹

Paed., I, vi, 37, 3. ›γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα· οὔπω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε.‹

Paed., I, vi, 45, 2. καὶ γάλα αὐτὸν ὀνομάζων ›ἐπότισα‹ ἐπιφέρει.

Paed., I, vi, 49, 2. ›γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα.‹

---

[1] A lost work. So also Strom., III, iii, 13, 1; 21, 2.

[2] QDS 26, 8 - 27, 1.

Strom., I, xxviii, 179, 2. ἐπεὶ ἤδει τινὰς γάλα μόνον εἰληφότας, οὐδέπω δὲ καὶ βρῶμα, αὐτίκα οὐχ ἁπλῶς γάλα.

Strom., V, iv, 26, 1. »ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἠδυνήθην λαλῆσαι ὑμῖν ὡς πνευματικοῖς ἀλλ' ὡς σαρκικοῖς, ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ. γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα· οὔπω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἔτι νῦν δύνασθε. . . .«

Strom., V, iv, 66, 1. »κἀγώ, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἠδυνήθην ὑμῖν λαλῆσαι ὡς πνευματικοῖς, ἀλλ' ὡς σαρκίνοις, ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ. γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα· οὔπω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἔτι νῦν δύνασθε. . . .«

In the first reference[1] Clement quotes the words »γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα« from the second verse. He inserts »ὡς νηπίους ἐν Χριστῷ« from the first verse and then continues with the remainder of the second verse. In the second reference,[2] which is a part of the same discussion by Clement, he inserts the words »ἐν Χριστῷ« and »ὡς νηπίους« in the same place. In five other references[3] Clement gives readings without this insertion.

This example has already been discussed.[4] The heretics, who insisted that they had received the perfection which was not available to all Christians, have apparently made good use of this passage from Paul to prove that some are πνευματικοί while others are σάρκινοι. Clement turns the passage against the heretics' teaching by stating that all Christians should consider themselves as νήπιοι. Thus the

---

[1]Paed., I, vi, 34, 3.

[2]Paed., I, vi, 35, 2.

[3]Paed., I, vi, 36, 2; I, vi, 36, 5; I, vi, 37, 3; Strom., V, iv, 26, 1; V, iv, 66, 1.

[4]Chap. II, pp. 48-51.

passage should be understood: "I fed you with milk, as little ones in Christ." "Can it be," he asks, "that the particle 'as [ὡς],' which shows that a metaphor [παραβολή] is being used, really indicates some such thing as this (in fact do we not have to read the whole sentence in this way?): 'I have fed you milk in Christ,' and then, after a short pause, adding 'as little ones'?" The passage would thus convey the meaning: "I have instructed [κατήκησα (i.e., 'taught by word of mouth')] you in Christ, who is the simple and true and real spiritual nourishment [τροφῇ]." Or the passage may be understood in this manner: "Just as the nurse nourishes new-born children [τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς νεογνοὺς] with milk, so also I have nourished you with Christ the Word who is milk, feeding you, bit by bit, a spiritual nourishment [πνευματικὴν τροφήν]."[1]

The meaning of this passage has been changed completely through use of the principle of allegory.

Colossians 1:26-28

Strom., I, i, 15, 5. [v. 28] ›νουθετοῦντες‹ γράφει ›πάντα ἄνθρωπον καὶ διδάσκοντες ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ.‹

Strom., V, x, 60, 3. [v. 26] ›τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν, ὃ νῦν ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, [v. 27] οἷς ἠθέλησιν ὁ θεὸς γνωρίσαι, τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.‹

Strom., V, x, 61, 1. [v. 26] ὥστε ἄλλα μὲν τὰ μυστήρια τὰ ἀποκεκρυμμένα ἄχρι τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῶν παραδοφέντα ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου παρειλήφασιν (ἀποκεκρυμμένα

---

[1] Paed., I, vi, 34, 3 - 35, 3.

δὲ ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ διαθήκῃ), ἃ ⟩νῦν ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις,⟨ [v. 27] ἄλλο δὲ ⟩τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν⟨, ὅ ἐστιν ἡ πίστις καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡ εἰς Χριστόν, ὃν ἀλλαχῇ ⟩θεμέλιον⟨ εἴρηκεν.

Strom., V, x, 61, 2-3. [v. 28] ⟩νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ·⟨ οὐ ⟩πάντα⟨ ἁπλῶς ⟩ἄνθρωπον⟨, ἐπεὶ οὐδεὶς ἂν ἦν ἄπιστος, οὐδὲ μὴν ⟩πάντα⟨ τὸν πιστεύοντα ⟩τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ⟨ ἀλλὰ ⟩πάντα ἄνθρωπον⟨ λέγει, ὡς εἰπεῖν ὅλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οἷον σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ ἡγνισμένον.

Clement knows the reading τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον in Colossians 1:26.[1] Nevertheless, he also gives the reading τὰ μυστήρια τὰ ἀποκεκρυμμένα.[2] In verse twenty-eight he reads πάντα ἄνθρωπον both as "every man"[3] and with the interpretation of ὅλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ("the whole man").[4]

These two readings have already been discussed.[5] The mystery (τὸ μυστήριον) is revealed to all, even to the Gentiles. The mysteries which are hid (τὰ μυστήρια τὰ ἀποκεκρυμμένα) were delivered by the Lord through the apostles to the saints as secret tradition. The mysteries, reserved for a few and transmitted under the veil of parables, are not delivered to "every man [⟩πάντα ἄνθρωπον⟨]" but to "all the man [⟩πάντα ἄνθρωπον⟨], as if he said the whole man

---

[1] Strom., V, x, 60, 3.

[2] Strom., V, x, 61, 1.

[3] Strom., I, i, 15, 5.

[4] Strom., V, x, 61, 3.

[5] Chap. II, p. 51.

[ὅλον τὸν ἄνθρωπον], as if purified in body and soul."

By changing μυστήριον to μυστήρια and understanding πάντα ἄνθρωπον as τὸν πάντα ἄνθρωπον, Clement has drastically changed the meaning of Paul.

These two readings are based upon the principle of allegory.

Since the hidden meaning is concealed in the written tradition, Clement often presents interpretations quite different from the literal meaning. He understood these interpretations as a part of the tradition which he received. In allegory there is no need to change the reading of a citation. The higher meaning of the text may be explained in the commentary. This is Clement's usual practice.

In view of the fact that Clement was capable of deriving an interpretation compatible with his teaching, there would be no compulsion to alter the text in order that the meaning should be changed. When Clement substitutes his allegorical reading within a text, he is not, in his opinion, altering the text or its meaning; he is presenting the text in its higher meaning. Thus a variant based on the principle of allegory may constitute a change in the wording of the text but, for Clement, the variant does not constitute a change in the true meaning. Variants based on the allegorical principle are not made in an effort to conceal the original intent of the text but to reveal the true meaning.

Unity of Scripture

The third classification, the unity of Scripture, includes those examples in which Clement reads one passage in the light of, or in harmonization with, another passage. Christ, the Logos, prophesied and appeared in the Old Testament and produced both Old and New Testaments. Both Testaments served the Word as a means of educating mankind. There is no sharp distinction between the Gospel as found in gospel writings and the Gospel as found in apostolic writings. There is only one revelation in various forms from the beginning to the present. The apparent inconsistencies are due to a misunderstanding of the nature of Scripture. The divine mysteries are expressed in parables. These are understood only by those who receive and observe the exposition of the Scriptures according to the ecclesiastical canon. Thus one part of Scripture enlightens another.

Matthew 5:3; cf. Luke 6:20

Protr., X, 99, 4. ⟩ὑμῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεῖα τῶν οὐρανῶν.⟨[1]

Strom., IV, vi, 26, 3. ⟩μακάριοι δὲ καὶ[2] οἱ πρωχοὶ⟨ εἴτε πνεύματι εἴτε περιουσίᾳ διὰ δικαιοσύνην δηλονότι.

QDS 16, 3. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μακαριζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ πτωχὸς τῷ πνεύματι καλούμενος.

---

[1]Mt. 5:3, 10 have αὐτῶν; Lk. 6:20 has ὑμετέρα (or the variant αὐτῶν). The context offers no help in locating this reading.

[2]"both . . . and."

QDS 17, 5. διὸ καὶ προσέθηκεν ὁ Ματθαῖος· ›μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί‹ πῶς; ›τῷ πνεύματι.‹

This is not primarily a change in the text; it is the understanding of one passage in the light of another. A man may hold possessions as gifts from God if he ministers from them for the sake of his brothers rather than himself and if he lives superior to the possessions. "This is the man who is blessed by the Lord and called poor in spirit, a ready inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, not a rich man[1] who cannot obtain life."[2]

Therefore Matthew added (προσέθηκεν) "in spirit" to "Blessed are the poor."[3]

Clement proposes the exegetical principle that the Savior applied poverty and riches "both to spiritual things and objects of sense [καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν αἰσθητῶν]." The Christian concern in every circumstance is to act for righteousness' sake. "And if 'they hunger after righteousness itself,'[4] they are blessed." Thus the poor are blessed, whether poor in spirit ('spiritual things') or in possessions ('objects of sense') upon the condition that they are poor for righteousness' sake.[5]

---

[1]Rich in worldly goods which are carried in the heart in place of God's spirit.

[2]QDS 16, 3.

[3]QDS 17, 5.

[4]Cf. Mt. 5:16.

[5]Strom., IV, vi, 21, 1-4.

Clement not only deliberately chooses the Matthean reading τῷ πνεύματι, but so conditions the interpretation in Stromateis IV that διὰ δικαιοσύνην becomes a necessary part of the text.

This is an example of the principle of the unity of Scripture. In adding "in spirit" Matthew is making clear what Luke meant by "the poor."

Matthew 5:9-10

Protr., X, 99, 4. [v. 10b] ›ὑμῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν‹[1]

Strom., I, 1, 7, 2. [v. 9a] ›μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί.‹

Strom., IV, vi, 25, 1. [v. 10a] ›μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης.‹

Strom., IV, vi, 26, 2. [v. 10a] ὡς οὖν τοὺς δεδιωγμένους . . . μακαρίους λέγει.

Strom., IV, vi, 40, 2. [v. 9a] ›Μακάριοι‹ τοίνυν ›οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί.‹

Strom., IV, vi, 41, 2. [v. 10] ›μακάριοι‹ φησίν, ›οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, [v. 9b] ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται,‹ ἢ ὡς τινες τῶν μετατιθέντων τὰ εὐαγγέλια· ›μακάριοι‹, φησίν, ›οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ὑπὲρ τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἔσονται τέλειοι. καὶ μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκα μοῦ, ὅτι ἔξουσι τόπον ὅπου οὐ διωχθήσονται.‹

Strom., IV, xvi, 104, 1. [v. 9b] υἱοὺς ˘ κληθῆναι δηλονότι.

The interesting reading of these two verses lies in the fact that Clement employs the conclusion in Matthew 5:9b

---

[1]Mt. 5:3, 10 have αὐτῶν; Lk. 6:20 has ὑμετέρα (or the variant αὐτῶν). The context offers no help in locating this reading.

for the beatitude in Matthew 5:10a.[1] F. C. Burkitt suggests: "Perhaps the blessing on the peace-makers had slipped into the next verse in Clement's MS."[2] Burkitt's assumption that the fault might lie in Clement's text has merit in view of the fact that this instance should be considered a careful and deliberate citation. Clement gives the 'correct' reading as distinct from "those who transpose the Gospels [ὥς τινες τῶν μετατιθέντων (perhaps better here, 'change,' or 'alter') τὰ εὐαγγέλια]," by sub-joining to Matthew 5:10a "for they shall be perfect" or "for they shall have a place where they shall not be persecuted." Harnack[3] identifies οἱ μετατιθέντες as Marcionites. It is better now to designate them as Clement's adversaries, the heretical Gnostics.

The problem is made more difficult in that Clement never quotes either beatitude in full.[4] In addition to the combined quotation, verse 9a appears twice, verse 9b once,[5] verse 10a twice, and verse 10b once.

Clement is discussing the beatitudes as they reflect a contempt for pain, poverty, and all external things. He

---

[1] Strom., IV, vi, 41, 2.

[2] Barnard, p. 5.

[3] Adolf Harnack, Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius (2d ed.; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1958), Pt. I, Vol. I, p. 192.

[4] Rejecting Burkitt's theory that the combined verse represents Clement's full verse.

[5] Accepting Strom., IV, xvi, 104, 1 as verse 9b.

begins the immediate context[1] with "blessed are the peacemakers," who having subdued the menaces of anger, lust, and passion, "who having lived in the knowledge both of good works and true reason, shall be reinstated in adoption [εἰς υἱοθεσίαν ('adoption as sone') ἀποκατασταθήσονται]." The concluding phrase of this statement indicates that Clement associated sonship with peacemakers. He then adds that the Lord teaches, as the sum of all virtue, "that for love to God we must gnostically despise death," when He says, "Blessed are they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for they shall be called the sons of God." In persecution we learn that "the perfect peacemaking [ἡ τελεία εἰρηνοποίησις] is that which keeps unchanged in all circumstances what is peaceful [τὸ εἰρηνικόν]." In persecution we are peacemakers in our contempt for pain and even death, and are thus "sons of God," or, as those who alter the Gospels would state it, we become "perfect," or we achieve a "place" where we "shall not be persecuted."

Clement knew the full reading of both verses. He preferred to read the two as parallel statements: 'Blessed are the peacemakers, those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for they shall be called the sons of God.'

Further on in the same discussion[2] Clement reveals the basis for his interpretation of Matthew 5:9f. in a

---

[1] Strom., IV, vi, 40, 2 - 41, 4.

[2] Strom., IV, xvi, 103, 2 - 104, 1.

passage from the Wisdom of Solomon:

> The divine Wisdom says of martyrs, "They seemed in the eyes of the foolish to die, and their departure was reckoned a calamity, and their migration from us an affliction. But they are in peace [οἱ δὲ εἰσεν ἐν εἰρήνῃ]. For though in the sight of men they were punished, their hope was full of immortality." He then adds, teaching martyrdom to be a glorious purification, "And being chastened a little, they shall be benefited much; because God proved them," that is, suffered them to be tried, to put them to the proof, and to put to shame the author of their trial, "and found them worthy of Himself," plainly to be called sons [υἱοὺς κληθῆναι δηλονότι].[1]

Through the principle of the unity of Scripture Clement, by applying a reading from the Wisdom of Solomon, makes one beatitude (in parallelism) of the two beatitudes in Matthew 5:9-10.

Matthew 5:27-28

Protr., X, 108, 5. ›οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, ἐπιθυμίᾳ γὰρ μόνῃ μεμοίχευκας.‹

Paed., II, vi, 51, 2. τὸ ›οὐ μοιχεύσεις‹ διὰ τοῦ ›οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις.‹

Paed., III, v, 33, 2. ›ὁ γὰρ ἐμβλέψας‹, φησί, ›περιεργότερον ἤδη ἥμαρτεν.‹

Paed., III, xi, 82, 5. οὐ γὰρ ἁψαμένους μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεασαμένους ἔστιν ἁμαρτεῖν.

Strom., II, xi, 50, 2. ›ὁ ἰδὼν πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν ἐμοίχευσεν.‹

Strom., II, xiv, 61, 3. καὶ ὁ ›ἐμβλέψας πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν‹ κρίνεται. διὸ ›μηδὲ ἐπιθυμήσῃς‹ λέγει.

---

[1] Wisdom of Solomon 3:2-8.

Strom., II, xv, 66, 1. ›ὁ γὰρ ἐπιθυμήσας ἤδη μεμοίχευκε‹ θησίν.

Strom., III, ii, 8, 4. ὃ μὲν γάρ φησιν· ›οὐ μοιχεύσεις,‹ τὸ δὲ ›πᾶς ὁ προσβλέπων κατ' ἐπιθυμίαν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν‹ λέγει.

Strom., III, ii, 9, 1. ›ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις.‹

Strom., III, iv, 31, 1. ›ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω, μὴ ἐπιθυμήσῃς.‹

Strom., III, xi, 71, 3. ›ἠκούσατε τοῦ νόμου παραγγέλλοντος· οὐ μοιχεύσεις. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω· οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις.‹

Strom., III, xi, 76, 1. τὸ γὰρ ›οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις‹ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γεγραμμένον τῷ νόμῳ περιτίθησιν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῇ

Strom., III, xiv, 94, 3. ›πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτήν.‹

Strom., IV, xii, 82, 2. [Quoting Basilides] ὡς γὰρ ὁ μοιχεῦσαι θέλων μοιχός ἐστι, κἂν τοῦ μοιχεῦσαι μὴ ἐπιτύχῃ.

Strom., IV, xviii, 114, 2. ›ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω, ὁ <ἐμ>βλέψας τῇ γυναικὶ πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν ἤδη μεμοίχευσεν.‹

Strom., VII, xi, 60, 4. ›μὴ μοιχεύσῃς.‹

Strom., VII, xiii, 82, 3. ›μὴ ἐμβλέψῃς‹ δὲ ›πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν ἀλλοτρίᾳ γυναικί‹[1]

A composite of the above readings furnishes the following text: ›ἠκούσατε τοῦ νόμου παραγγέλλοντος· οὐ μοιχεύσεις. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ˇ πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ˇ .‹

The phrase τοῦ νόμου παραγγέλοντος is an editorial explanation of ὅτι ἐρρέθη. The omissions of ὑμῖν ὅτι are stylistic in every case. Thus, Clement furnishes evidence

---

[1]The fact that Clement cites this passage seventeen times indicates a pre-occupation with this subject.

that he knew the normative text of these two verses with the exception of the final ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

Clement's interpretative method for these two verses is the rabbinic method of hedging the law. The law commands, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." But "adultery is only the fruit of lust, and lust is its evil root." The Educator "is ever skillful in cutting to the very roots of sin." Adultery is prohibited by prohibiting lust (τὸ Οὐ μοιχεύσεις διὰ τοῦ Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις).[1]

Thus the Logos is saying: 'You heard when I commanded you not to commit adultery. If anyone even looks at a woman lustfully, he has already committed adultery.[2] Therefore in commanding you not to commit adultery I commanded you not to lust.' From this interpretation emerges the 'wise law and holy saying': "Thou shall not lust, for lust by itself [ἐπιθυμία γὰρ μόνη] is an act of adultery."[3]

Clement's readings give the divine prohibition with

---

[1] Paed., II, vi, 51, 2. In Christ the Educator, p. 138, Wood misses Clement's meaning in translating: "He is . . . commanding: 'Thou shalt not lust,' to safeguard the other command: 'Thou shalt not commit adultery.'" Διὰ τοῦ should be understood as 'through the agency of.' See F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammer of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. and rev. by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 119. The point is that Clement understands the two as one command restated for our sake.

[2] Notice that ἐν τδ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ weakens the interpretation.

[3] Protr., X, 108, 5. In v. 28 MSS 983, 1689 add μηδε επιθυμησης after ὑμῖν .

μοιχεύω four times (οὐ μοιχεύσεις three times, μὴ μοιχεύσῃς once) and with ἐπιθυμέω five times (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις three times, μὴ ἐπιθυμήσῃς twice).

This doctrinal variant is possible for Clement only because of his principle of unity of Scripture. The one Logos spoke the one word of life throughout the Scriptures. This unity is clearly expressed in the following statement:

> While I am on this point I think I must not omit mention of the fact that the apostle declares that the same God is the God of the law, the prophets, and the gospel. In the Epistle to the Romans he quotes the gospel saying "Thou shalt not lust [﴿οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις﴾]" as if it were the law, knowing that it is the one Father who is preached by the law and the prophets. For he says: "What shall we say? Is the law sin? God forbid. I had not known sin except through the law; and I had not known lust [τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν], unless the law had said, Thou shalt not lust [﴿οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις﴾][1]."[2]

The phrase, πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι, in Matthew 5:28 indicates to Clement that, through the principle of unity of Scripture, when one reads οὐ μοιχεύσεις[3] one should understand οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις.[4]

Matthew 10:40; Lk. 10:16

QDS 30, 6. ﴿[Mt.] ὁ ὑμᾶς δεχόμενος ἐμὲ δέχεται, [Lk.] ὁ ὑμᾶς μὴ δεχόμενος ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ.﴾

---

[1]Rom. 7:7.

[2]Strom., III, xi, 76, 1f.

[3]Ex. 20:13; Deut. 5:17; Mt. 5:27.

[4]Ex. 20:17; Deut. 5:21; Rom. 7:7.

Both Matthew 10:40 and Luke 10:16 include, after the instructions to the twelve (or seventy), a saying concerning those who receive (or hear) the disciples. Clement understands ὁ ὑμᾶς μὴ δεχόμενος to be the equivalent of ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς. He is thus able to emphasize the δεχόμενος in Matthew (where there is no contrasting statement), and yet include the contrast in Luke (ἀκούων with ἀθετῶν).

This variant is submitted as a simple, clear example of the numerous occasions in which Clement does not distort the meaning of the text, but through harmonization, paraphrase, or stylistic interest disregards the exact wording of the text. There is no question that in this instance he intended for the full citation to stand as a quotation of the words of Jesus.

Matthew 18:3

Protr., IX, 82, 4. ⟩ἡ γὰρ μὴ ˘ αὖθις ὡς τὰ παιδία γένησθε καὶ ἀναχεχυθῆτε⟨ ὥς φησιν ἡ γραφή, τὸν ὅντως ὄντα πατέρα οὐ μὴ ἀποδέξησθε, ⟩οὐδ' οὐ μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθέ ποτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.⟨

Paed., I, v, 12, 4. ⟩ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία ταῦτα, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.⟨

Paed., I, v, 16, 2. ⟩ἣν μὴ ˘ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία ταῦτα οὐκ εἰσελεύσεσθε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.⟨

Strom., III, xii, 88, 1. οὕτως οὖν ἐπιστραφέντας ἡμᾶς αὖθις ὡς τὰ παιδία γενέσθαι βούλεται, τὸν ὄντως πατέρα ἐπιγνόντας, δι' ὕδατος ἀναχεχυθέντας, ἅλλης ταύτης οὔσης <ἢ τῆς> ἐν τῇ κτίσει ἀπορρᾴδος.

Strom., IV, xxv, 160, 2. ⟩ἐὰν μὴ στραφέντες γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία.⟨

Strom., V, i, 13, 4. »κἂν μὴ ˘ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία ταῦτα, οὐκ εἰσελεύσεσθε«, φησίν, »εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.«

Strom., V, v, 30, 3. λέγων ὡς τὰ παιδία αὐτοὺς γενέσθαι δεῖν.

It is clearly evident that Clement knew the normal reading of this verse.[1]

In two similar instances Clement departs radically from the text.[2] Barnard suggests that Clement was perhaps familiar with a quotation by some previous author in some such form as: ἢν μὴ ἐπιστραφῆτε καὶ αὖθις ὡς τὰ παιδία γένησθε καὶ ἀναγεννηθῆτε τὸν ὄντως ὄντα πατέρα οὐ μὴ ἀπολάβητε οὐδ' οὐ μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.[3]

In the first instance[4] Clement is maintaining that God speaks as a "'tender father' admonishing his sons." We are exhorted to come to God as his νεολαία. "For 'except ye become once more [αὖθις ('again, anew'), cf., Jn. 3:5, ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῇ . . . εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, and the implication of αὖθις from ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν of verse 3 and δεύτερον of verse 4] as little children and be born again [ἀναγεννηθῆτε, cf. I Pet. 1:23,

---

[1]But in seven citations in which the word παιδία occurs Clement adds ταῦτα three times.

[2]Protr., IX, 82, 4; Strom., III, xii, 88, 1.

[3]Barnard, p. 21.

[4]Protr., IX, 82, 4.

ἀναγεγεννημένοι],' as the Scripture says, ye shall not receive the true Father [τὸν ὄντως ὄντα πατέρα], 'nor shall ye enter the kingdom of heaven.'" When he "receives the Father [τὸν πατέρα ἀπολάβῃ] . . . then he will share the Father's kingdom [τότε τῆς βασιλείας τῆς πατρώας] with the true Son [τῷ γησίῳ]." This is the "'church of the first born,' which is composed of many good children [ἐκ πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν παιδίων]." Thus, we are "the first born sons [πρωτότοκοι παῖδες] . . . God's nurslings [οἱ τρόφιμοι τοῦ θεοῦ]."

The saying in Matthew is concerned with teaching the humility of a child rather than seeking greatness. Clement picks up the thought of becoming ὡς τὰ παιδία to teach our relationship with God the Father. The understanding of the verse is controlled by the doctrine of rebirth.[1] Clement explicates the passage by stating that receiving the Father is sharing the Father's kingdom. Thus τὸν ὄντως ὄντα πατέρα οὐ μὴ ἀπολάβητε becomes a part of the properly understood quotation.

The same association with rebirth is seen in the second instance.[2] Clement in speaking of marriage and the begetting of children quotes the saying: "Call no man your father on earth, for you have one Father who is in heaven."[3]

---

[1] Jn. 3:5; I Pet. 1:23.

[2] Strom., III, xii, 88, 1.

[3] Mt. 23:9.

"He thus wishes us to turn ourselves again [αὖθις] and become as children who have come to know the true Father [τὸν ὄντως πατέρα ἐπιγνόντας] and are reborn through water [δι' ὕδατος ἀναγεννηθέντας, cf. Jn. 3:5, γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος, and I Pet. 1:23, ἀναγεγεννημένοι] by a generation [σποράς, cf., I Pet., οὐκ ἐκ σποράς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου] different from birth in the created world."

Further support for the association of Matthew 18:3 with I Peter 1:23 may be seen in Clement's discussion of an inscription on a temple to Epidaurus:

> . . . hearing the word of truth [κατακούντες τοῦ λόγου τῆς ἀληθείας (I Pet. 1:22, ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας)] guilelessly [ἀδόλως (I Pet. 2:1, ἀποφέμενοι πάντα δόλον, I Pet. 2:2, ἄδολον)] and purely, as children [τῶν παίδων (I Pet. 2:2, ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη)] who obey us [πειθομένων ἡμῖν (I Pet. 1:22, ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ)]. . . . "Pure he must be [ἁγνὸν χρὴ ἔμμεναι (I Pet. 1:22 ἡνικότες)] who goes within [ἐντὸς ἰόντα (Mt. 18:3, εἰσελεύσεσθε)] the incense-perfumed fane [νηοῖο θυώδεος (Mt. 18:3, εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν)]; and purity is to think holy thoughts [φρονεῖν ὅσια (I Pet. 2:2, τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε_]." "Except ye become as these little children, ye shall not enter," it is said, "into the kingdom of heaven [Mt. 18:3]."[1]

This treatment is not a harmonization of text but a harmonization of interpretation. The idea of 'becoming as little children' is equated with the idea of rebirth in John and I Peter. Such interpretation is possible because of Clement's doctrine of the unity of the Scriptures as the expression of the one Logos. The words τὸν ὄντως ὄντα

---

[1] Strom., V, i, 13, 2 - 4.

πατέρα or δι' ὕδατος ἀναγεννηθέντας are a part of the quotation as read in the light of the full revelation of the Logos.

Matthew 25:33

Paed., I, v, 14, 2. καὶ Ἐτὰ ἀρνία δέ μου, ὅταν λέγῃ, Ἐστήτω ἐκ δεξιῶν, τοὺς ἀφελεῖς αἰνίττεται, παῖδας ὡς ἄρνας, οὐκ ἄνδρας <ὡς> πρόβατα ὄντας κατὰ γένος.

Paed., I, viii, 71, 3. ὁ γὰρ ἱστὰς τοὺς μὲν ἐκ δεξιῶν, τοὺς δὲ ἐξ εὐωνύμων.

Strom., IV, vi, 30, 1. οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἐκ δεξιῶν ἵστανται τοῦ ἁγιάσματος . . . οἱ δὲ ἐξ εὐωνύμων ἱστάμενοι κατὰ τὴν τούτων εἰκόνα.

Clement devotes the fifth chapter of The Instructor, I to proof from scripture that the followers of the Instructor are understood as 'children.' Matthew 25:33 is one of the proof-texts of this proposition. Clement changes τὰ πρόβατα to read τὰ ἀρνία (the diminutive of ἀρήν).[1]

That the substitution is deliberate is seen from the comment in which the quotation appears: "Whenever he says, 'Let my little lambs stand on my right,' he is intimating the simple, those who are according to the category of children as lambs [ὡς ἄρνας], not of men as sheep [<ὡς> πρόβατα]."[2]

---

[1] Paed., I, v, 14, 2.

[2] In The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Wilson translates: "He alludes to the simple children, as if they were sheep and lambs in nature, not men." Wood in Christ the Educator, p. 15, translates: "He means the simple: children, not men, for they are in the category of sheep." Harl in Clément d'Alexandrie, Le Pédagogue, Liver I, p. 137, follows Stählin's emendation of inserting <ὡς> before πρόβατα and renders the

Clement could have used the passage of the Fourth Gospel in which Jesus speaks of τὰ ἀρνία μου.[1] Properly understood Clement did use the passage. When Jesus (in Matthew) speaks of τὰ πρόβαταhe "intimates [αἰνίττεται, 'shadows forth, hints at, refers to as in a riddle']" τὰ ἀρνία μου which he makes clear in a post-resurrection appearance.

For Clement this is interpretation, not alteration, made possible through his principle of the unity of Scripture.

John 1:13

Strom., II, xiii, 58, 2. τὸν οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός, ἐν πνεύματι δὲ ἀναγεννώμενον.

Strom., III, vii, 58, 1. οὐ γάρ ἐσμεν ἐπιθυμίας τέκνα, ἀλλὰ θελήματος.

Clement's reading of John 1:13 furnishes a cogent example of the complexity of his variants.[2] He is writing on repentance and forgiveness. The "works also of his former life" must "be abandoned by him who has been 'born again [ἀναγεννώμενον], not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh,' but in the Spirit [ἐν πνεύματι δὲ (Jn. 1:13, ἐκ θεοῦ)]."[3]

---

correct translation of "il désigne symboliquement les simples: ils sont de la race des enfants, comme les agneaux, et non pas des adultes, comme les brebis."

[1] Jn. 25:15.

[2] Cf. the variant on Mt. 18:3 above.

[3] Strom., II, xiii, 58, 1f.

Clement is influenced by the first half of this sentence,[1] which he does not quote, in which the following words occur: ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι. The appellation of τέκνα θεοῦ for those who have been saved is, for Clement, a synonym for παιδία in Matthew 18:3: ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε [notice the fitting association with the discussion of repentance] καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία. Τέκνα (παιδία) in both Matthew 18:3 and in John 1:13 is associated with the spiritual birth of John 3:3-7. Οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς . . . ἐγεννήθησαν [Jn. 3:6, τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σάρξ ἐστιν], ἐν πνεύματι δὲ ἀναγεννώμενον [Jn. 3:6, καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος πνεῦμά ἐστιν]. The phrases γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν (Jn. 3:3), δεύτερον εἰσελθεῖν (Jn. 3:4, and γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν (Jn. 3:7) have influenced the reading ἀναγεννώμενον.[2]

The reading τέκνα . . . θελήματος[3] would indicate that Clement was familiar with the more acceptable reading.

Although John 1:13 does not offer as striking an example as Matthew 18:3 (where the association is between two Gospels), it does furnish evidence for Clement's principle of the unity of Scripture. Stählin does not enclose in quotation marks the phrase ἐν πνεύματι δὲ ἀναγεννώμενον, but

---

[1] Jn. 1:12.

[2] Cf. I Pet. 1:23.

[3] Strom., III, vii, 58, 1.

Clement would have understood that these words were a part of Scripture.

John 14:27

QDS 37, 4. καὶ μέλλων σπένδεσθαι καὶ λύτρον ἑαυτὸν ἐπιδιδοὺς καινὴν ἡμῖν διαθήκην καταλιμπάνει· ἀγάπην ὑμῖν δίδωμι τὴν ἐμήν.

Resch[1] and Zahn[2] understand that Clement has in mind the words from John 14:27: εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν. Barnard states: "While the form of Clement's words is taken from this verse [John 14:27], the context shows that he is thinking rather of xiii, 34: hence the substitution of ἀγάπην for εἰρήνην."[3] Clement's καταλιμπάνει may be compared with ἀφίημι of John 14:27; his καινὴν διαθήκην may be compared to ἐντολὴν καινήν of John 13:34. John 13:34 is concerned with ἀγάπη.[4]

Clement follows his citation with an interpretation.

> What love is this, and how great? On behalf of each of us He laid down the life that is equal in value to the whole world. In return He demands this sacrifice from us on behalf of one another. . . .[5]

---

[1]Resch, Agraphon 110, p. 162.

[2]Theodor Zahn, Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons (Erlangen: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1889), I, 174.

[3]Barnard, p. 60.

[4]Cf. Jn. 15:9-10.

[5]QDS 37, 4-6.

The inclusion of ἀγάπη is intentional.

The reading is unique. It is based on Clement's understanding of love as the distinctive grace of the new covenant. "'God,' then, being good, 'is love,'[1] it is said . . . 'Love is,' then, 'the fulfilling of the law',[2] like as Christ, that is the presence of the Lord who loves us; and our loving teaching of, and discipline according to Christ. By love, then [ἀγάπῃ γοῦν], the commands not to commit adultery, and not to covet one's neighbour's wife, are fulfilled [τελειοῦται], [these sins being] formerly prohibited by fear.[3]

Since πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη, then ἡ ἀγάπη is ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη which Christ leaves behind: ›ἀγάπην ὑμῖν δίδωμι τὴν ἐμήν.‹ Clement alters the reading of John 14:27 in compliance with his understanding of Matthew 5:17; John 13:34; 15:9, 10; and Romans 13:10. This reading has occurred through Clement's principle of the unity of scripture.

I Corinthians 2:9; I Peter 1:12

Protr., X, 94, 4. ›ἣν ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν οὐδὲ οὖς ἤκουσεν, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρκίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη. . . .‹

Protr., XII, 118, 4. ›ἃ οὔτε οὖς ἤκουσε οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνέβη‹ τινός.

Paed., I, vi, 37, 1. ›ἣ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν οὐδὲ ἐπὶ νοῦν ἀνθρώπου [οὐκ] ἀνέβη,‹ . . . ›ὃ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσέν ΠΩΣ.‹

---

[1] I Jn. 4:8, 16. [2] Rom. 13:10.

[3] Strom. IV, xviii, 113, 4-6.

Paed., II, xii, 129, 4. ›ὃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν οὐδὲ οὖς ἤκουσε‹ πρότερον.

Paed., III, xii, 86, 2. ›ἃ οὔτε οὖς ἤκουσεν οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνέβη ποτέ.‹

Strom., II, iv, 15, 3. ›ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν οὐδὲ οὖς ἤκουσεν οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη.‹

Strom., IV, xviii, 114, 1. ›ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν οὐδὲ οὖς ἤκουσεν οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη.‹

Strom., IV, xxii, 135, 3. ›ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.‹

Strom., V, iv, 25, 4. ›ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν. . . .‹

Strom., V, vi, 40, 1. ›ἣν ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη.‹

Strom., VI, viii, 68, 1. ›ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνέβη ἀνθρώπων‹, πολὺ ἂν διασαφῆναι τὸν περὶ τούτων λόγον ἡμῖν τὸν διδάσκαλον.

QDS 23, 3. [I Cor. 2:9] ›ἃ μήτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδε μήτε οὖς ἤκουσε μήτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπων ἀνέβη, [I Pet. 1:12] εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι καὶ ἰδεῖν [I Cor. 2:9] ἅπερ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀγαθὰ καὶ τοῖς φιλοῦσιν αὐτὸν τέκνοις.‹

Exc. ex Theo., 10, 5. [Clement] ›ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε καὶ οὖ- οὐκ ἤκουσεν οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη.‹

Exc. ex Theo., 86, 3. [Theodotus] [I Cor. 2:9] τὰ ›ἡτοιμασμένα ἀγαθά, [I Pet. 1:12] εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι.‹

Ecl. Proph., 65, 1. τὸ ἀναβῆναι ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν.

In one passage Clement adds ›ποτε‹ after ›ὃ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσαν‹ ("'what ear never heard'").[1] In a second passage he adds πρότερον after ›οὐδὲ οὖς ἤκουσε‹ ("'nor ear

---

[1] Paed., I, vi, 37, 1.

heard' before").[1] In a third passage he adds ὁπότε after οὔτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνέβη ("'nor the heart conceived ever'").[2] In a fourth passage he adds πρὶν ἤ with the infinitive after οὐδὲ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνέβη ἀνθρώπων ("'nor the heart of men conceived' before the Teacher told the account of them to us").[3] In eight occurrences there are no such qualifying adverbs.

In The Rich Man's Salvation some insight is offered to these additions. The Savior announces, "I give you new birth [ἐγώ σε ἀνεγέννησα (cf. I Pet. 1:3, ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς)], when by the world you were evilly born for death. . . . For I will lead you up [ἀνάξω] to a rest [εἰς ἀνάπαυσιν] and to an enjoyment of unspeakable and indescribable good things 'which eye has not seen nor ear heard, nor have they entered into the heart of man [ἃ μήτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδε μήτε οὖς ἤκουσε μήτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπων ἀνέβη (cf. I Cor. 2:9)], which angels desire to look into and to see [εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι καὶ ἰδεῖν (I Pet. 1:12, εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι)] what good things God has prepared for His saints and for His children that love Him [ἅπερ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀγαθὰ καὶ τοῖς φιλοῦσιν αὐτὸν τέκνοις (I Cor. 2:9, ἃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς

---

[1] Paed., II, xii, 129, 4.

[2] Paed., III, xii, 86, 2.

[3] Strom., VI, viii, 68, 1.

ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν; I Pet. 1:14, ὡς τέκνα ὑπακοῆς; I Pet. 1:15, ἅγιοι)].'"[1]

Theodotus makes the same association of I Corinthians 2:9 and I Peter 1:12. "These [the faithful souls] are the children [τὰ παιδία] who are now resting [συναναπαυόμενα] in bed and 'the wise virgins,' with whom the others, who are late, did not enter into 'the goods which have been prepared [τὰ ἡτοιμασμένα ἀγαθά (cf. I Cor. 2:9)] on which the angels desire to gaze [εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι (cf. I Pet. 1:12)].'"[2]

Clement's comment on this section of I Peter is preserved in a Latin fragment.

> Hence it appears that the soul is not naturally immortal; but is made immortal by the grace of God, through faith and righteousness, and by knowledge. "Of which salvation," he says, "the prophets have inquired and searched diligently," and what follows.[3] It is declared by this that the prophets spake with wisdom, and that the Spirit of Christ was in them, according to the possession of Christ, and in subjection to Christ. For God works through archangels and kindred angels, who are called spirits of Christ.
>
> "Which are now," he says, "reported unto you by them that have preached the Gospel unto you."[4] The old things which were done by the prophets and escaped the observation of most, are now revealed to you by the evangelists. "For to you," he says, "they are manifested by the Holy Ghost who was sent;"[5]

---

[1] QDS 23, 3.

[2] Exc. ex Theo., 86, 3.

[3] I Pet. 1:10-11.

[4] I Pet. 1:12.

[5] I Pet. 1:12.

> that is the Paraclete, of whom the Lord said, "If I go not away, He will not come."[1] "Unto whom," it is said, "the angels desire to look;"[2] not the apostate angels, as most suspect, but, what is a divine truth, angels who desire to obtain the advantage of that perfection.[3]

The goal (τέλος) of the Gnostic is contemplation (θεωρία).[4] "The knowledge of God and eternal salvation are so inseparably connected as to be in fact identical."[5] The illumination which is the gift of God to the Gnostic reveals "that which no eye has seen" until it was announced by the evangelists "through the Holy Spirit sent from heaven." The context of I Corinthians 2:9 has not been neglected.[6] "God has revealed to us through the Spirit [ἡμῖν γὰρ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος (cf. I Pet. 1:12, ἀπεκαλύφθη and ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ)]. For the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God."[7] "So also no one comprehends the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God. Now we have received . . . the Spirit which is from God, that we might understand the gifts bestowed on us by God."[8]

The age of illumination is the post-resurrection age

---

[1] Jn. 16:7. [2] I Pet. 1:12.

[3] Adumbrationes Clementis Alexandrini in Epistolos Canonicas, I. In Epistola Petri Prima Catholica, 1:10-12.

[4] Strom., VII, xiii, 83, 3.

[5] Tollinton, II, 98.

[6] Strom., V, iv, 25, 4 cites verses 9 and 10.

[7] I Cor. 2:10. [8] I Cor. 2:11-12.

of the Spirit. I Peter 1:10-12 is an exposition of I Corinthians 2:10-13. The prophets inquired concerning this state of salvation. It was revealed that the Christian Gnostic should receive the vision, through the Spirit, "into which the angels longed to look."[1]

This is an example of the principle of the unity of scripture. The fact that Theodotus also offers this interpretation indicates the same association in the Gnostic tradition.

Clement's principle of unity of Scripture goes beyond the concepts that one part of the Bible may help in understanding another part, or that one part of the Bible can be properly understood only in the light of the entire Bible. Although Clement granted a diversity of expression, he taught that all Scripture was the product of the one Logos. What the Logos said at one time might have been spoken for the very purpose of making explicit what he had only implied at another time. To insert a phrase from Peter into a quotation from Paul was not to misquote Paul but simply to quote the Logos who had spoken through both Paul and Peter. Such practice might produce variants within the text as quoted, but, for Clement, it was not a variant of what the Logos had

---

[1]In addition to I Pet. 1:12, παρακύπτειν appears only in Jn. 20:5, 11 (and the late addition of Lk. 24:12) where Peter and Mary "stoop to look" into the empty tomb of the resurrected Christ.

said. That which was spoken in Peter, for example, had also been spoken in Paul, though perhaps in an enigmatic form.

The controlling principle of acceptable interpretation of one portion of Scripture by another was the principle of tradition. Both the principle of allegory and the principle of unity of Scripture are controlled by the principle of tradition. It would appear that tradition at times even included which portions were interpretations of other portions. In the example immediately above, based on I Corinthians 2:9, it would appear that Theodotus also shared the tradition which understood I Peter 1:10-12 to be an exposition of I Corinthians 2:10-13.

Selectivity

The classification of selectivity includes those readings in which words or phrases are omitted as incompatible with Clement's doctrine or the immediate interpretation. Those large areas of the New Testament which are unattested in Clement's writings will not be considered. They may at times indicate intentional silence, but they do not demonstrate actual variants of the text. Clement not only admits the principle of selectivity but defends its proper use within the understanding and practice of the godly tradition.

Matthew 5:45

Protr., XI, 114, 3. ›ἐπὶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἀνατέλλει τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ.‹

Paed., I, viii, 72, 2. ›ὁ πατήρ μου‹ φησὶν ›ἐπιλάμπει τὸν ἥλιον τὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πάντας.‹

Paed., I, viii, 72, 3. ›ὁ πατήρ μου‹ φησὶ ›βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους.‹

Paed., I, ix, 88, 2. καὶ τὸν ἥλιον ἐπιλάμποντος τὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν καταπέμποντος τὸν αὐτοῦ.

Strom., IV, xiv, 95, 1. ›ἵνα γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.‹

Strom., IV, xxii, 137, 2. ἐπὶ ›δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους.‹

Strom., V, iii, 18, 7. ἐπεὶ καὶ τῆς θείας χάριτος ὁ ὑετὸς ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους καταπέμπεται.

Strom., VI, iii, 29, 2. ›ὁ βρέχων ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους.‹

Strom., VII, xiv, 85, 2. ›ὅ‹ τε γὰρ ›θεὸς ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους τὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπιλάμπει ἥλιον‹ καὶ τὸν κύριόν γε αὐτὸν ἐπὶ δικαίους ἔπεμψεν καὶ ἀδίκους.

Strom., VII, xiv, 86, 5. ›ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους‹ τὸ εὐμενὲς τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῶν ἔργων καθάπερ ὁ ἥλιος ἐπιλάμποντες.

Exc. ex Theo., 93, 3. [Clement] (›βρέχει γὰρ ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους καὶ τὸν ἥλιον ἐπιλάμπει πᾶσιν.‹)

The above citations witness to the following composite citations: ›ἵνα γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ˙ ἐπὶ πάντας <ἀνθρώπους> ἀνατέλλει τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους.‹

Although the verse is frequently cited, the words, ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθούς , never appear. There are five citations in which the clause concerning God's causing the sun to rise (or shine) is included. Of these five ἐπὶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους appears once, ἐπὶ πάντας once, πᾶσιν once,

and ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους (from the following clause) twice. One is immediately impressed with Clement's studied avoidance of the phrase, "on the evil and on the good." Clement has chosen to employ this verse in demonstrating that God alone is good in that "he is kind to the ungrateful and the selfish [»ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηρούς«]."[1] The Word Himself explicitly states: "No one is good [οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός] but my Father in heaven."[2] For "My Father makes His sun to shine upon all [ἐπὶ πάντας]," and "My Father sends His rain upon the just and the unjust." "He sends them upon all [ἐπὶ πάντας], because He portions out an equal share of virtue justly; He is good [ἀγαθὸς], because He sends it upon the just and the unjust alike [ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους ὁμοίως]."[3]

The same interpretation is given in the following passage:

> Therefore, God is good of Himself, but just for our sake and because He is good. His justice is revealed to us through His Word who has descended from above where the Father has always been. . . . The nature of His love is the origin of His justice, making His sun to shine [τὸν ἥλιον ἐπιλάμποντος τὸν αὐτοῦ] and sending down His own Son.[4]

Clement rejects the phrase, »ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθούς,« because »ἀγαθούς« applied to men would deny him

---

[1]Lk. 6:35. [2]Mt. 19:17.

[3]Paed., I, viii, 72, 2f.

[4]Paed., I, ix, 88, 2.

the use of this entire verse in demonstrating God's goodness as forgiving love.[1] That Clement was acquainted with the rejected phrase is evident from the fact that in one instance he picks up the parallel passage from Luke where πονηρούς is connected with ἀχαρίστους.[2]

The reading constitutes a doctrinal variant of omission based on the principle of selectivity.

Clement witnesses to the more regular reading of ἀνατέλλει once; but in the four other instances when this word should appear, he substitutes some form of ἐπιλάμπειν. In his praise of Light it is advantageous to use the idea of God causing his sun to rise:

> The universe has become sleepless light and the setting has turned into rising [ἡ δύσις εἰς ἀνατολήν]. . . . For He who rides over the universe, "the sun of righteousness," visits mankind impartially, imitating His Father who "causes His sun to rise [ἀνατέλλει] upon all men," and sprinkles them all with the dew of truth. He it was who changed the setting into a rising [τὴν δύσιν εἰς ἀνατολήν], and crucified death into life.[3]

It is conjectured that Clement simply prefers ἐπιλάμπειν in that it gives a better balanced and esthetically pleasing sentence: 'God causes the sun to shine and the rain to fall on all men.'

---

[1] See also Strom., VII, xiv, 85, 2; 86, 5.

[2] Lk. 6:35.

[3] Protr., XI, 114, 3f.

Matthew 8:20

Strom., I, iii, 23, 2. ›αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν, ˘ ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ.‹

Strom., IV, vi, 31, 2. ›αἱ ἀλώπεκες ἄρα φωλεοὺς ἔχουσι.‹

Strom., IV, vi, 31, 4. ›πετεινὰ‹ γὰρ ›οὐρανοῦ.‹

A composite reading witnesses to the following text: ›αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν ˘ πετεινὰ οὐρανοῦ ˘ , ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ.‹

In speaking against the Sophists, Clement quotes Solon's observation: "Each of you walks in the steps of a fox, and in all of you is an empty mind."[1] This is signified in the saying: "Foxes have holes, but the Son of man has nowhere to lay his head." The connection is the catchword 'fox,' but the relationship is supposedly made less tenuous by adding: All but believers are wild beasts (θηρίων), and thus on the believer alone "rests the head of the universe [ἐπαναπαύεται τὸ κεφάλαιον τῶν ὄντων], the kind and gentle word."[2] This is allegory which has no relation to the original meaning which concerns the poverty of Jesus. Clement therefore has no need for the phrase "birds of the heaven."

In a second use of this verse Clement states that the Lord "called those evil and earthly men who are occupied about wealth which is mined and dug from the ground, foxes."[3]

---

[1]Solon, Fragments 5 and 6.

[2]Strom., I, iii, 23, 1-3.

[3]Strom., IV, vi, 31, 2.

In Matthew both foxes and birds who have their places of rest are distinguished from the Son of man who has no such place. In Clement the foxes, who are evil and earthly men, are distinguished from the birds: "For he applied the name 'birds of heaven [»πετεινὰ« γὰρ »οὐρανοῦ« (in this specific play on words, 'winged ones of heaven')]' to those in heaven [τοὺς οὐρανῷ] having been distinguished from the other birds [τῶν ἄλλων ὀρνέων (the neuter from of ὄρνις, the generic term for 'bird')], to those really pure, to those able to fly [πτητικοὺς (notice the play on words: the πετεινά are not just ὄρνεα, but πτητικοί)] to the knowledge of the heavenly Word [εἰς τὴν τοῦ οὐρανίου λόγου γνῶσιν]."[1] While the 'holes' of the foxes offer meaning for Clement's interpretation, the 'nests' of the birds are not only irrelevant but detrimental to the interpretation. The earth-bound connotation of 'nests' mitigates against the image of the free soul in flight "to the knowledge of the heavenly Word." Clement deliberately omits κατασκηνώσεις.

---

[1]In The Ante-Nicene Fathers, II, 414, Wilson renders the following translation: "For He applied the name 'fowls of the air' to those who were distinct from the other birds--those really pure, those that have the power of flying to the knowledge of the heavenly Word." This translation leaves out οὐρανῷ and fails to convey the connection between 'flight' and 'heaven.' Clement is distinguishing between πετεινὰ οὐρανοῦ who are capable of flight to the knowledge of the heavenly Word in that they possess freedom from riches, honor, marriage, and poverty, and ἄλλων ὀρνέων who have nests, constituting the cares of the world, which pinion their wings. The foxes are those who have worldly cares; the birds of heaven are those who have gnostic apathy.

The entire verse is subjected to radical allegorical treatment which entails one deliberate omission. This omission is a unique doctrinal variant.

I Corinthians 13:8

Paed., II, i, 5, 3. ›ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε πίπτει.‹

QDS 38, 2. ›ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε ἐκπίπτει, προφητεῖαι καταργοῦνται, γλῶσσαι παύονται, ἰάσεις ἐπὶ γῆς καταλείπονται. . . .‹

The example has been discussed above.[1] Clement quotes I Corinthians 13:6-7 and the eighth verse through ›γλῶσσαι παύονται.‹ He simply cannot find compatible the words εἴτε γνῶσις, καταργηθήσεται, which he replaces with his own ›ἰάσεις ἐπὶ γῆς καταλείπονται.‹ Neither will he quote ἐκ μέρους γὰρ γινώσκομεν and its development in verses nine and ten. He concludes his quotation with the thirteenth verse. This is deliberate selectivity.

I Corinthians 13:12

Paed., I, vi, 36, 6. ›βλέπομεν γὰρ ὡς δι' ἐσόπτρου νῦν,‹ ὁ αὐτὸς ἀπόστολος λέγει, ›τότε δὲ πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον.‹

Strom., I, xix, 94, 4-6. ›βλέπομεν γὰρ νῦν ὡς δι' ἐσόπτρου ‹ . . . ›πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον.‹

Strom., IV, iii, 12, 2. τὸν μηκέτι ›δι' ἐσόπτρου ‹, τὴν γνῶσιν τοῦ θεοῦ κατοψόμενον.

Strom., V, i, 7, 5. ›βλέπομεν γὰρ νῦν ὡς δι' ἐσόπτρου ‹, τότε δὲ πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον.‹

---

[1]Chapter III, p. 124.

Strom., V, vi, 40, 1. ›πρόσωπον‹ ἤδη ›πρὸς πρόσωπον.‹

Strom., V, xi, 74, 1. ›βλέπομεν γῦν ὡς δι' ἐσόπτρου ˘ ‹ φησί, ›τότε πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον.‹

Strom., VI, xii, 102, 2. ›πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον.‹

Strom., VII, iii, 13, 1. οὐκ ἐν κατόπτροις ἢ διὰ κατόπτρων.

Strom., VII, x, 57, 1. πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον.

Strom., VII, xi, 68, 4. ›πρόσωπον‹, φησί, ›πρὸς πρόσωπον.‹

Exc. ex Theo., 15, 2. [Clement] ›ἄρτι βλέπομεν δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι, τότε δὲ πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον.‹

Exc. ex Theo., 27, 4. [Clement] ›πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον.‹

In The Excerpta ex Theodoto 15, 2, Clement quotes I Corinthians 13:12a including the words ἄρτι ('just now,' 'this moment,' as contrasted with the future) and ἐν αἰνίγματι. In four other citations[1] he substitutes νῦν ('present time,' as τὸ νῦν, 'the present') for ἄρτι, inserts ὡς before δι' ἐσόπτρου, and omits ἐν αἰνίγματι. He makes no use of I Corinthians 13:12b: ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην.

Clement is involved in the controversy with heretical Gnosticism. At baptism the Christian receives the light which enables one to see God clearly.[2] He has not yet received "the gift of perfection [τὴν τελείαν δωρεάν]," but he is already in the light. "Perfection lies ahead, in the resurrection of the faithful, but it consists in obtaining the promise which

---

[1] Paed., I, vi, 36, 6; Strom., I, xix, 94, 4-6; V, i, 7, 5; V, xi, 74, 1.

[2] Paed., I, vi, 26, 2.

has already been given to us."[1]

God may be seen both "by reflection [καὶ κατ' ἔμφασιν] and direct vision [δὲ καὶ διάφασιν]."[2] No one during the time of life has been able "to apprehend God clearly [τὸν θεὸν ἐναργῶς ('visibly,' 'manifestly') καταλαβέσθαι]. But 'the pure in heart shall see God,'[3] when they arrive at the final perfection [εἰς τὴν ἐσκάτην τελείωσιν]."[4] Nevertheless the Gnostic prays that "becoming pure in heart through the knowledge [δι' ἐπιγνώσεως], which is by the Son of God, he may be initiated [μυηθῇ (as 'initiated into the mysteries')] into the beatific vision [τὴν μακαρίαν θέαν (better here, 'contemplation')] face to face."[5] He keeps moving to higher regions until he no longer greets "the divine vision [τὴν φεωρίαν τὴν θείαν] in or by means of mirrors [ἐν κατόπτροις ἢ διὰ κατόπτρων]" but feasts forever on the never-ending sight.[6] The gnostic soul, being perfectly purified, is now deemed "worthy to behold forever the Almighty face to face. For having been made entirely spiritual it departs to its kindred sphere and there, in the spiritual Church, abides in

---

[1] Paed., I, vi, 28, 3.

[2] Strom., I, xix, 94, 7.

[3] Mt. 5:8.

[4] Strom., V, i, 7, 7.

[5] Strom., VI, xii, 102, 2.

[6] Strom., VII, iii, 13, 1.

the rest of God."[1]

Clement is seeking to maintain both the fulfillment of the promised perfect vision of God and the presently available knowledge of God through contemplation within the gnostic way of life. There will be a difference in degree of fulfillment, but for the Gnostic the knowledge available is not of a different quality. Contemplation of God is a present reality. The Gnostic simply does not see ἐν αἰνίγματι.

This is a clear example of the principle of selectivity.

Ephesians 4:13

Paed., I, vi, 34, 2. τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃν μόνον ἄνδρα ἡ γραφὴ . . . καλεῖ.

Strom., IV, xxi, 132, 1. ⟩μέχρι καταντήσωμεν πάντες εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ.⟨

Strom., V, viii, 48, 9. ⟩εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας ˘ .⟨

Strom., VI, ix, 73, 3. ⟩εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως.⟨

Strom., VI, xi, 87, 2. ⟩εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως.⟨

Strom., VI, xi, 97, 1. ὁ γνωστικὸς . . . εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας ˘ τελείας ἀφικνεῖσθαι σπεύδει.

Strom., VI, xiii, 107, 1. ⟩εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως.⟨

Strom., VI, xiii, 107, 3. ἄχρις ἂν ⟩εἰς τέλειαν ἄνδραν⟨ αὐξήσωσιν.

Strom., VI, xiv, 114, 4. τῶν ⟩εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον⟨ ἀφικνουμένων.

---

[1]Strom., VII, xi, 68, 4-5.

Strom., VII, ii, 10, 1. ἄχρις ἂν ›καταντήσῃ εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον.‹

Strom., VII, vi, 34, 2. ›εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως.‹

Strom., VII, vii, 46, 7. καὶ τὰ ἐπαναβεβηκὸς ὕψος ἀνδρὸς ἐντελοῦς.

Strom., VII, xi, 68, 1. ›τέλειον‹ ὡς ἀληθῶς ›ἄνδρα εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας ‹ αὐξήσαντα.

Strom., VII, xiv, 84, 2. καὶ δὴ τῆς κατὰ τὸν γνωστικὸν . . . ἀπαθείας, καθ' ἣν ἡ τελείωσις τοῦ πιστοῦ δι' ἀγάπης ›εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας ‹ προβαίνουσα ἀφικνεῖται ἐξομοιουμένη θεῷ, ›ἰσάγγελος‹ ἀληθῶς γινομένη.

Strom., VII, xvii, 107, 5. ›εἰς ἑνότητα πίστεως.‹

Exc. ex Theo., 1, 3. [Clement] καὶ ζύμην ἑνοποιοῦσα<ν> εἰς πίστιν.

Ecl. proph., 60, 2. ›εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως.‹

Although Clement refers to Ephesians 4:13 seventeen times, only once does he quote the verse in its entirety.[1] In four references it would appear that Clement deliberately avoids the words, τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ .[2]

The heretics, opposed by Clement, insisted that they had already received 'the perfection' (τὸ τέλειον). Clement taught that final fulfillment of the promise would take place only in the world to come.[3]

In the one instance in which the words τοῦ

---

[1] Strom., IV, xxi, 132, 1. In an extended citation including verses 11-13.

[2] Strom., V, viii, 48, 9; Vi, xi, 97, 1; VII, xi, 68, 1; VII, xiv, 84, 2.

[3] Cf. Paed., I, vi, 34-36.

πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ are included, Clement is very careful to specify their proper interpretation. "We are then to strive to reach manhood [ἀπανδροῦσθαι] as befits the Gnostic, and to be as perfect [τελειοῦσθαι] as we can while still abiding in the flesh [ἔτι ἐν σαρκὶ καταμένοντας], making it our study with perfect concord here [ἐνθένδε, better, 'from perfect concord thence to . . .'] to concur with the will of God, to the restoration of what is the truly perfect nobleness and relationship, to the fulness of Christ [εἰς τὸ ⟩πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ⟨], that which perfectly depends on our perfection."[1]

The heretics maintained that man was created perfect. Clement replies that man is created for the acquisition of virtue (ἀρετή). "He who is a Gnostic, and righteous, and holy with prudence, hastes to reach [ἀφικνεῖσθαι σπεύδει] the measure of perfect manhood [εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τελείας]."[2] But he becomes "a perfect man indeed [⟩τέλειον⟨ ὡς ἀληθῶς ⟩ἄνδρα⟨] grown to the full measure of stature [⟩εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας⟨ αὐξήσαντα]"[3] only because "having been made entirely spiritual it [the gnostic soul] departs to its kindred sphere and there, in the spiritual Church, abides in the rest of God."[4] The perfecting of the believer advances

---

[1] Strom., IV, xxi, 132, 1.

[2] Strom., VI, xi, 97, 1.

[3] Strom., VII, xii, 68, 2.

[4] Strom., VII, xii, 68, 5.

"till it arrives at the perfect man [εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον], at the measure of the stature [εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας], being made like God [ἐξομοιουμένη θεῷ] and having become truly equal to the angels[1] [ἰσάγγελος ἀληθῶς γινομένη]."[2]

One may become 'like God' and 'equal to the angels,' but the 'measure of the stature' is not to be modified by 'the fullness of Christ.' Such careful omission must indicate that the heretics who claimed 'perfection' as 'spiritual ones' habitually described their state as 'the fullnes of Christ.'

Although this use among heretical Gnostics cannot be documented, the studied avoidance of the term by Clement in discussions of 'the perfect man' is evident. His omission constitutes an example of the principle of selectivity.

In every example given above of the principle of selectivity Clement has made a radical change in the original meaning of the text. In each case the words which have been omitted are detrimental to Clement's teaching. Clement's writings furnish ample proof that through allegory he was capable of finding the meaning he desired in difficult texts. Should he have been challenged by an adversary, he would defend the authority of every word of a text and proceed to render its higher meaning. In certain instances, where no

---

[1]Lk. 20:36.

[2]Strom., VII, xiv, 84, 2.

challenge is present, he appears to avoid the difficult reading for the sake of clarity and simplicity of instruction. In other words, he disregards an issue which would momentarily confuse for the sake of getting on to the point of his concern. He did this in the assurance that his interpretation could be defended in detail if the occasion arose.

Again in the principle of selectivity, as in the principles of allegory and unity of Scripture, the controlling and authoritative principle is tradition.

CONCLUSION

The basis for this investigation is the recognized fact that Clement's quotations from the New Testament vary frequently and often widely from the more acceptable manuscript evidence. This study has examined the New Testament citations in Clement's writings to determine the degree to which these variants represent deliberate doctrinal motivations. The investigation has led to the conclusion that Clement did deliberately change certain readings for doctrinal reasons. Therefore, citations from the New Testament in the writings of Clement are not necessarily representative of the text which Clement knew and used. As a result, it is an unreliable practice to offer any New Testament quotation from Clement as evidence for his biblical text without first considering carefully the circumstance and purpose of the quotation. It is possible for a notation of a Clementine variant to be completely meaningless in the reconstruction of a text or texts in use in Alexandria during the second century.

Three implications may be drawn from this conclusion. In the first place, Clement's citations do not necessarily witness to the use of a corrupted text. The conditions of the text in second century Alexandria must be determined by

other evidence than a collection, out of context, of Clement's New Testament citations.

In the second place, Clement was not careless in his use of Scripture. It is improper to propose that Clement falsified the text or that he sought to maintain an untenable doctrine of canon and authority. Clement's writings are primarily concerned with doctrine; and doctrine involves the definition of authority and the manner in which this authority may be applied. He is careful to make clear that his authority is the godly tradition, both written and unwritten. This means that he should and that he does treat Scripture seriously. The principles of interpretation which govern his use of Scripture are frankly stated and generally carefully followed. Although he reproduces an exceedingly poor text by twentieth century standards, he understands that his task is not to deliver a copy of his text but to deliver the true teaching of his tradition. As a teacher Clement seeks to point out the true meaning of his tradition.

In the third place, however, this does not mean that Clement's New Testament citations are worthless for an understanding of the text which Clement knew. It has been demonstrated that quite often the textual variants in Clement are understandable in the light of the context in which they are used, his doctrinal interest, and his principles of interpretation. And this clearly indicates that before a New Testament citation from Clement may be used as textual

evidence, it must first be carefully considered in some manner similar to that used in this study.

It may be thought that Clement simply demonstrates the long suspected fluidity of the text in the second and third centuries. The force of this investigation has been to show that one major factor in Clement's variation from the text is not mere fluidity. Rather Clement comes to the text with complete seriousness, and yet with purposes and principles of interpretation which, when not understood by the reader, appear to distort the New Testament.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works of Clement

Alexandrian Christianity. Translated by John Ernest Leonard Oulton and Henry Chadwick. ("The Library of Christian Classics," vol. II.) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325. Vol. II: Fathers of the Second Century. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Rev. ed. edited by A. Cleveland Coxe. Translation of the works of Clement by W. Wilson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951.

Clément d'Alexandrie. Extraits de Théodote. With translation and notes by F. Sagnard. ("Sources Chrétiennes," no. 23.) Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1948.

_____. Le Pédagogue I. With introduction and notes by Henri-Irénée Marrou and with translation by Marguerite Harl. ("Sources Chrétiennes," no. 70.) Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1960.

_____. Le Protreptique. With translation and notes by Claude Mondésert and André Plassart. 2nd ed. ("Sources Chrétiennes," no. 2.) Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1949.

_____. Les Stromates I. With introduction by Claude Mondésert and with translation and notes by Marcel Çaster. ("Sources Chrétiennes," no. 30.) Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1951.

_____. Les Stromates II. With introduction and notes by P. Th. Camelot and with translation by C. Mondésert. ("Sources Chrétiennes," no. 38.) Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1954.

Clement of Alexandria. Edited and translated by G. W. Butterworth. ("The Loeb Classical Library.") London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1953.

Clement of Alexandria. Christ the Educator. Translated by Simon P. Wpod. ("The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation," vol. XXIII.) New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1954.

Clemens Alexandrinus. Vol. I: Protrepticus und Paedagogus. Edited by Otto Stählin. 2nd ed. ("Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte," vol. XII.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1936.

Clemens Alexandrinus. Vol. II: Stromata Buch I-VI. Edited by Otto Stählin and Ludwig Früchtel. 3rd ed. ("Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte," vol. LII.) Berlin: Akademic Verlag, 1960.

Clemens Alexandrinus. Vol. III: Stromata Buch VII und VIII, Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae Propheticae, Quis Dives Salvetur, und Fragmente. Edited by Otto Stählin. ("Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte," vol. XVII.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1909.

Clemens Alexandrinus. Vol. IV: Register. Edited by Otto Stählin. ("Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte," vol. XXXIX.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1936.

The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria. Edited with translation, introduction, and notes by Robert Pierce Casey. ("Studies and Documents," vol. I.) London: Christophers, 1934.

New Testament Texts

The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculus II: The Gospels and Acts [P^{45}]. Edited by Frederic G. Kenyon. London: Emery Walker Limited, 1933.

The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculus III: Pauline Epistles and Revelation [P^{47}]. Edited by Frederic G. Kenyon. London: Emery Walker Limited, 1934.

The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculus III Supplement: Pauline Epistles [P^{46}]. Edited by Frederic G. Kenyon. London: Emery Walker Limited, 1936.

Novum Testamentum Graece. Vols. I-II. Edited by Constantinus Tischendorf. 8th ed. Lipsiae: Giesecke and Devrient, 1869-1872.

Novum Testamentum Graece. Vol. III: Prolegomena. Prolegomena to Tischendorf's text by Casparus Renatus Gregory. 8th ed. Lipsiae: J. C. Henrichs, 1884.

Novum Testamentum Graece. Edited by Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, and Kurt Aland. 25th ed. Stuttgart: Würtembergische Bibelanstalt, 1964.

Novum Testamentum Graece secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum. Vol. I: Euangelium secundum Matthaeum. Edited by S. C. E. Legg. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1940.

Novum Testamentum Graece secumdum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum. Vol. II: Euangelium secundum Marcum. Edited by S. C. E. Legg. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1935.

Papyrus Bodmer II: Evangile de Jean chap. 1-14 [P^{66}]. Edited by Victor Martin. Cologny-Genève: Bibliothèque Bodmer, 1956.

Papyrus Bodmer II, Supplément: Evangile de Jean chap. 14-21 [P^{66}]. Edited by Victor Martin. Cologny-Genève: Bibliothèque Bodmer, 1958.

Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Evangile de Luc chap. 3-24 [P^{75}]. Edited by Victor Martin and Rodolphe Kasser. Cologny-Genève: Bibliotheque Bodmer, 1961.

Payrus Bodmer XV: Evangile de Jean chap. 1-15 [P^{75}]. Edited by Victor Martin and Rodolphe Kasser. Cologny-Genève: Bibliothèque Bodmer, 1961.

Books

A Diognete. With introduction, translation, and commentary by Henri-Irénée Marrou. ("Sources Chretiennes," no. 33.) Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1951.

Altaner, Berthold. Patrology. Translated by Hilda C. Graef. New York: Herder and Herder, 1960.

Bardy, Gustave. Clément d'Alexandrie. 2nd ed. ("Les Moralistes Chrétiens.") Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1926.

Barnard, P. Mordaunt. The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria in the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. With an introduction by F. C. Burkitt. ("Texts and Studies," vol. V, no. 5.) Cambridge: The University Press, 1899.

Barnett, Albert E. Paul Becomes a Literary Influence. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1941.

Bigg, Charles. The Christian Platonists of Alexandria. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1886.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammer of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bréhier, Émile. Les Idées Philosophiques et Religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie. ("Études de Philosophie Médiévale," vol. VIII.) Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1950.

Bultmann, Rudolph. Essays Philosophical and Theological. Translated by James C. G. Greig. New York: The MacMillian Co., 1955.

_____. Existence and Faith. Translated by Schubert M. Ogden. New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1960.

Buri, Fritz. Clemens Alexandrinus und der Paulinische Freiheitsbegriff. Zürich: Max Niehans Verlag, 1939.

Camelot, P. Th. Foi et Gnose: Introduction à l'étude de la connaissance mystique chez Clément d'Alexandrie. ("Études de Théologie et d'Histoire de la Spiritualité'," vol. III.) Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1945.

Cognat, J. Clément d'Alexandrie, sa doctrine et sa polémique. Paris: E. Dentu, Librairie-Éditeur, 1858.

Echle, Harry A. The Terminology of the Sacrament of Regeneration according to Clement of Alexandria. ("The Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology," Second Series, no. 30.) Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1949.

Eissfeldt, Otto. The Old Testament: An Introduction. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Faye, Eugene de. Clément d'Alexandrie: Étude sur les Rapports du Christianisme et de la Philosophie Grecque au IIe Siècle. Paris: Ernest Le Roux, 1898.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. A History of Early Christian Literature. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Harnack, Adolf. Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius. Erster Theil, Die Überlieferung und der Bestand. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1893.

_____. History of Dogma. Vol. II. Translated by Neil Buchanan. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1897.

_____. The Origins of the New Testament and the Most Important Consequences of the New Creation. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. Covenant Garden: Williams and Norgate, Ltd., 1925.

Heinish, Paul. Der Einfluss Philos auf die älteste Christliche Exegese: Barnabas, Justin und Clemens von Alexandria. (Alttestamentliche Abhundlungen," Heft 1/2.) Münster i. W.: Verlag der Aschendorffachen Buchhandlung, 1908.

Hermetica: The Ancient Greek and Latin Writings which Contain Religious or Philosophical Teachings Ascribed to Hermas Trismegistus. Edited with translation and notes by Walter Scott. 4 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1924.

Hitchcock, F. R. Montgomery. Clement of Alexandria. London: S.P.C.K., 1899.

Jaeger, Werner. Early Christianity and Greek Paideia. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1961.

Kutter, Hermann. Clemens Alexandrinus und das Neue Testament. Giessen: J. Richer'sche Buchhandlung, 1897.

Lampe, G. W. H., and K. J. Woollcombe. Essays on Typology. ("Studies in Biblical Theology," no. 22.) Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1957.

Meecham, Henry G. The Epistle to Diognetus. Manchester: The University Press, 1949.

Mondésert, Claude. Clément d'Alexandrie: Introduction à l'Étude de sa pensée religieuse à partir de l'Écriture. ("Études Publiées sous la Direction de la Faculté de Théologie S. J. de Lyon-Fourviere," no. 4.) Paris: Aubier, 1944.

Munck, Johannes. Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandria. ("Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte," Band II.) Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933.

Osborn, E. F. The Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria. Cambridge: The University Press, 1957.

Patrick, John. Clement of Alexandria. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1914.

A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Edited by G. W. H. Lampe. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961.

Quasten, Johannes. Patrology. 2 vols. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1951-1953.

Quatember, Friedrich. Die christliche Lebenshaltung des Klemens von Alexandrien nach seinem Pädagogus. Wien: Verlag Herdern, 1946.

Rahner, Hugo. Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1945.

Resch, Alfred. Agrapha: Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente. ("Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur," Band IV, Heft 3/4.) Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906.

Tollinton, R. B. Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Liberalism. 2 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1914.

Völker, Walther. Der wahre Gnostiker nach Clemens Alexandrinus. ("Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literature," vol. LVII.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1952.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.

Zahn, Theodor. Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur. Theil III, Supplementum Clementinum. Erlangen: Vorlag von Andreas Deichert, 1884.

Zahn, Theodor. Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Vol. I: Das Neue Testament vor Origenes. Erlangen: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1889.

Articles

Aland, Kurt. "Neue neutestamentliche Papyri II," New Testament Studies, X (1963-1964), 62-79, and XI (1964-1965), 1-21.

Boer, W. Den. "Hermeneutic Problems in Early Christian Literature," Vigiliae Christianae, I (1947), 150-67.

Bouyer, Louis. "Holy Scripture and Tradition as Seen by the Fathers," The Eastern Churches Quarterly. Supplementary Issue: Tradition and Scripture, VII (1947), 1-16.

Burghardt, Walter J. "On Early Christian Exegesis," Theological Studies, XI (1950), 78-116.

Callaway, Joseph Sevier. "Paul's Letter to the Galatians and Plato's Lysis," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVII (1948), 353-55.

Camelot, P. Th. "Clément d'Alexandrie et l'Écriture," Revue Biblique, LIII (1946), 242-48.

Clark, Kenneth W. "The Meaning of ἐνεπτέω and καταπτέω in the New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, LIV (1935), 93-101.

_____. "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," Studia Pauline in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan, Septuagenarii. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. Unnik. Harlem: De Erven F. Bohn N. V., 1953, pp. 52-65.

Colwell, Ernest Cadman. "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text," The Bible in Modern Scholarship. Edited by J. Philip Hyatt. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965, pp. 370-89.

Hitchcock, F. R. Montgomery. "Did Clement of Alexandria Know the Didaché?" The Journal of Theological Studies, XXIV (1923), 397-401.

Knowlton, E. C. "Notes on Early Allegory," The Journal of English and Germanic Philology, XXIX (1930), 159-81.

Oulton, J. E. L. "Clement of Alexandria and the Didaché," The Journal of Theological Studies, XLI (1940), 177-79.

Symonds, H. Edward. "The Patristic Doctrine of the Relation of Scripture and Tradition," The Eastern Churches Quarterly. Supplementary Issue: Tradition and Scripture, VII (1947), 59-70.

Tate, J. "On the History of Allegorism," The Classical Quarterly, XXVIII (1934), 105-14.

_____. "Plato and Allegorical Interpretation," The Classical Quarterly, XXIII (1929), 142-54, XXIV (1930), 1-10.

Unpublished Materials

Norris, John Massilon. "The Functional New Testament of Clement of Alexandria." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1945.

Titus, E. L. "The Motivation of Changes Made in the New Testament Text by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1942.

BIOGRAPHY

John W. Stewart was born November 19, 1915, in Athens, Georgia, to Mr. and Mrs. Henry Leon Stewart.

In 1936 he graduated from the University of Georgia with an A.B. degree. After working as a manager of a jewelry store and as an accountant, he served as an artillery officer during the Second World War. In 1944 he married Juliette Turner. There are two children: John W., Jr. and Mary Scott. He received the B.D. degree from Brite Divinity School, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas, in 1949. Following a pastorate, he was enrolled in the Graduate School of Duke University, 1953-1956. He was a Gurney Harris Kearns fellow during the academic year of 1955-1956.

Since September, 1956, he has served as assistant professor of Old Testament in Brite Divinity School, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas.